THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

# FRANCIS ROUS, PURITAN MYSTIC, 1579-1659:
## An Introduction to the Study of the Mystical Element in Puritanism

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
JERALD CARL BRAUER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
DECEMBER, 1948

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
PREFACE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . iii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION
Mysticism, Spiritualism, and Puritanism . . . . 1

II. MYSTIC AS PURITAN THEOLOGIAN . . . . . . . . . . . 48

III. THE HOLY SPIRIT AND SALVATION. . . . . . . . . . . 99

IV. THE MYSTICAL MARRIAGE. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 125

V. THE RULE OF THE SPIRIT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 188

VI. A MYSTIC AS PARLIAMENTARIAN. . . . . . . . . . . . 232

VII. CONCLUSION. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 279

APPENDIX A . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 308

SUMMARY. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 312

BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 331

# PREFACE

For the past year and a half the author has been engaged in constructing and in writing this thesis. The final product which has emerged is vastly different from the thesis plan originally envisaged. In the early stages of planning the thesis was concerned primarily with the political implications of the mystical theological of Sir Francis Rous. Also, the activities of such men as Sir Harry Vane Junior and Peter Sterry were to be viewed as part of the same movement of which Rous was a leader.

As research and writing progressed, it became apparent that the most pressing requirement was for an analysis of the thought and faith of Francis Rous as the earliest example of a Puritan mystic. His theology and its consequences were of a different type than that of Harry Vane's. Furthermore, the need for some kind of a typology presented itself. If justice was to be done to the foliation of Puritan theology, and if important and necessary distinctions were to be drawn, then the various types of the experiential element of Puritan faith had to be delineated. Thus, the thesis became an attempt to analyze the theology of Francis Rous and to indicate its relation to and development out of Puritanism.

The existence of Puritan mysticism has received scant attention from historians, and to my knowledge, there have been no studies of any genuine Puritan mystics. The primary aim of this thesis was to prove Francis Rous a Puritan mystic, the first Puritan mystic, and to show how he developed out of Puritanism and related his mysticism to the movement of which he was a part.

Rous deserves his place in the history of English mysticism alongside such recognized seventeenth century mystics as Traherne, Crashaw, and Augustine Baker. In order to prove him a mystic, an attempt was made to establish a typology which would at once mark him as a mystic yet distinguish him from men who represent a similar tendency of religious experience, but who are, nevertheless, a distinct type of their own.

The secondary aim of the thesis was to advance the typology and the analysis of Rous according to it as the first step in the clarification and elucidation of a greatly maligned, ignored, and confused aspect of Puritanism. Thus the discussion attempts to serve as an introduction to the further study of the mystical element in Puritanism, and through that, it hopes to propose several questions with regard to future research in Puritanism.

I wish to extend my thanks to the librarians and personnel of Swift and Harper libraries of the University of Chicago. Their kindness, promptness, and efficiency were a joy to experience. My indebtedness to various scholars, past and present, far exceeds the possibility of simple enumeration of names. Especially helpful was the advice and suggestions of Professor Winthrop S. Hudson who read the entire thesis and first suggested Sir Francis Rous as a possible thesis topic. Professors James Hastings Nichols and Joachim Wach also read the thesis and gave unsparingly of their time and advice. To the former, special thanks is due for his help after the departure of Professor Hudson shortly after the thesis was begun.

# INTRODUCTION

## MYSTICISM, SPIRITUALISM, AND PURITANISM

Written history is by necessity selective. In his attempt to relate the important events of the past or in his endeavor to explain how the present has emerged from the past, the historian selects certain material which forms the basis of his account. The selection of material is determined by the sources available, the relevance of the sources to the question or hypothesis of the historian, and to his own personal predilections which are formed by a combination of his own personality and the world-view which he has embraced.

It is evident, then, that there will be an element of relativism in all historical writing. Nevertheless, the acceptance and usage of a common method as well as a clear statement of the presuppositions and intentions of an author make possible a thorough examination of the historian's conclusions; thus the element of objectivity can be retained in historical writing.

The object of this monograph is to study the theology and activities of a seventeenth century Puritan leader who has been largely overlooked by the historians of English Puritanism. Where he has been included in certain studies his theology has not been related to the roots from which it sprang, the direction to which it led, or its proper place in contemporary Puritan thought. So, this thesis is but one more proof of the fact that the selectivity of written history can always be remedied by subsequent studies.

The primary aim of this thesis is to show that Francis

Rous[1] was an English Puritan mystic who deserves his rightful place in the history of English mysticism alongside such recognized men as Crashaw, Vaughn, and Traherne. Furthermore, the thesis contends that Rous's mysticism did not weaken his Puritan ethic but strengthened it with a dynamic that impelled him to activity. At the same time it will be evident that this mystical theology represents a broadening of Protestant Puritan piety through the introduction of a fervent emotional element seen in the relation of the soul to Christ as the Bridegroom. Finally, he represented a certain direction in Puritan thought that became dominant during the Commonwealth era and proved to be an influence in later Dutch developments.

If the main burden of this monograph is to prove Francis Rous a Puritan mystic of no little importance, the task of defining mysticism or a mystic becomes imperative. Only by proposing some type of adequate definition will it be possible to determine if this man is a mystic. Once the definition is made and applied to a particular Puritan leader such as Rous, the first step towards a typology for the entire field will have been taken.

One of the greatest needs in the study of seventeenth century Puritan thought is for just such a typology. Puritan piety and its relation to sociological problems of its day will not be adequately comprehended until its manifold diversity and foliation is properly understood. An adequate distinction between Puritan mystical thought and Puritan spiritualism has not yet been made.[2]

---

[1] See below, pp. 44-47.

[2] George Johnson, From Seeker to Finder: A Study In Seventeenth Century English Spiritualism Before The Quakers (Unpublished Thesis, Divinity School, The University of Chicago, 1948), pp. 2-4. The author of this thesis took a step in the right direction but failed adequately to define mysticism and spiritualism before he indicated their different attitudes towards certain sociological problems.

Rous[1] was an English Puritan mystic who deserves his rightful place in the history of English mysticism alongside such recognized men as Crashaw, Vaughn, and Traherne. Furthermore, the thesis contends that Rous's mysticism did not weaken his Puritan ethic but strengthened it with a dynamic that impelled him to activity. At the same time it will be evident that this mystical theology represents a broadening of Protestant Puritan piety through the introduction of a fervent emotional element seen in the relation of the soul to Christ as the Bridegroom. Finally, he represented a certain direction in Puritan thought that became dominant during the Commonwealth era and proved to be an influence in later Dutch developments.

If the main burden of this monograph is to prove Francis Rous a Puritan mystic of no little importance, the task of defining mysticism or a mystic becomes imperative. Only by proposing some type of adequate definition will it be possible to determine if this man is a mystic. Once the definition is made and applied to a particular Puritan leader such as Rous, the first step towards a typology for the entire field will have been taken.

One of the greatest needs in the study of seventeenth century Puritan thought is for just such a typology. Puritan piety and its relation to sociological problems of its day will not be adequately comprehended until its manifold diversity and foliation is properly understood. An adequate distinction between Puritan mystical thought and Puritan spiritualism has not yet been made.[2]

---

[1] See below, pp. 44-47.

[2] George Johnson, From Seeker to Finder: A Study In Seventeenth Century English Spiritualism Before The Quakers (Unpublished Thesis, Divinity School, The University of Chicago, 1948), pp. 2-4. The author of this thesis took a step in the right direction but failed adequately to define mysticism and spiritualism before he indicated their different attitudes towards certain sociological problems.

This is understandable because of the great similarity between the two; nevertheless, it is regrettable because of the confusion which results. In spite of the many parallels between mysticism and spiritualism they do have different centers of gravity which lead to certain peculiarities and differences in attitude towards the Church, sacraments, and ministry.

This chapter will attempt, first, to outline the nature of mysticism and spiritualism so one can note their basic differences in theory and consequent differences in practice. The tentative conclusions will serve as a means whereby one can determine what type of thinker Rous was and the relation of his thought to his political activities. Secondly, this chapter will point out certain tendencies within Puritan thought which were moving in the direction of spiritualism and mysticism. Such background will enable one to better understand the emergence of a mystic such as Rous and the flowering of Puritan piety in the direction of spiritualism.

It is granted that such a task entails a number of difficulties and is open to several objections. Mysticism and spiritualism are difficult to define in theory apart from numerous extracts from each type of piety; nevertheless, sufficient work has been done by a number of outstanding scholars to enable one to make certain generalizations concerning both movements. The attempt at a typology in this chapter is not intended to be definitive but hopes to make a beginning is made in the right direction by drawing up certain generalizations with regard to both types and then illustrating the Puritan mystic type by the thought and activity of Sir Francis Rous. Whether the typology is applicable to the general development of seventeenth century English Puritan thought and piety remains to be determined by future research.

## I

Probably few if any words in the English language have been so completely misunderstood and misinterpreted as has mysticism. The term has been applied to everything from wild antinomian ecstacies to extreme quietism. It has been used to describe any longing of the soul for God, any first hand religious experience, various theosophical, occult, or magical speculations, or any vague mysterious esoteric systems. Often it has been equated with pantheism, romanticism, idealism, or any system of imminence. Unfortunately, the English language does not possess two terms to distinguish between mysticism in a proper sense and all the various eccentric and speculative tendencies that masquerade under the legitimate term. Germans use the term *Mystik* when referring to mysticism in the good sense of the word, and they employ the term *Mysticismus* when speaking of the strange and weird movements that the man in the street considers typical mysticism.[1] This monograph intends to use the term only in the sense that *Mystik* suggests. Such a limitation is the first necessity in setting up a workable definition.

Secondly, while non-Christian mysticism exhibits certain basic affinities with Christian mysticism, the former will be disregarded in the definition to be proposed in this thesis. Though Christian mysticism is in a continual interaction with non-Christian mysticism, the definitive factor of the former is that it has come to grips with certain distinctively Christian influences and traditions. It always has some relation to the person of Christ, the reality of the Church, the Christian ethic, and the Christian sacraments.[1] In seeking a definition of mysticism that will furnish a sufficient basis for a comparison with spiritualism, we will confine our search to the mystics within the Christian pale.

---

[1] Rufus Jones, "Mysticism," *Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed., James Hastings ( New York: Scribner's Sons, 1928), IX, 83. "Mystik," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, (Tübingen: J.C.B.Muhr [Paul Siebeck], 1930), IV, 334 ff.

When one turns to the numerous definitions offered by outstanding authorities in the field, he is overwhelmed by the apparent difference of opinion. Within Christian mysticism itself there seem to be so many types that it appears almost impossible to frame any definition. There seem to be Christ mystics, reacting or acting mystics, nature mystics, interiorization mystics, Eastern mysticism, Western mysticism, Protestant mysticism and Roman Catholic mysticism. Yet, while maintaining these many necessary distinctions, can one find certain coherent principles or motifs that mark all these movements and men as distinctively mystical?

Dean Inge, in the appendix to his important work on mysticism, has included a series of twenty-six definitions of mysticism that range all the way from Harnack's designating it as Roman Catholic piety to Recejac's treating it as the tendency to approach the Absolute morally by using symbols.[2] Let us turn our attention to certain definitions offered by authors representing various schools and tendencies and see if a working definition can be produced.

A. B. Sharpe defines the mysticism which obtains in the Roman Catholic Church as supernatural mysticism.[3] The aim of all mystical endeavor is to know and feel the presence of God, not as theoretical knowledge, but as a fact of direct personal experience.[1] Natural mysticism attempts to achieve this by transcending the senses either through ascending the symbolic ladder of the external world or through a process of recollection and introversion, both of which aim to see God or ultimate reality.[2] Sharp says such a view is merely an attitude of mind towards one's surroundings.[3]

---

[1] Evelyn Underhill, The Mystic Way (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1913), p. vii.

[2] W. R. Inge, Christian Mysticism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), Appendix A, pp. 335-348.

[3] A. B. Sharpe, Mysticism Its True Nature and Value (London: Sands and Company, 1910), p. 15.

The Catholic type of mysticism holds to the complete transcendence of God yet also to his presence in power upholding all creation and life; thus one may know that God is but not what he is.[4] The mystic's goal being the direct, immediate, experimental knowledge of God, it is evident that his vision must be supernaturally bestowed by the grace of God.[5] The actual state of union, usually described as a spiritual marriage, is always transcient.[6] Furthermore, this union is more than a moral union or conformity of the heart with God.[7] But so great is the consciousness of the divine presence and the certainty of the ineffable union experience that one cannot adequately express it.[8] Finally, though the vision itself and the union experience are God's free gifts of grace, it is necessary to prepare the soul that she might be fit to receive her guest.[9]

The late Rufus Jones defined mysticism as "the type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence. It is religion in it most acute, intense, and living stage."[1] The mystic experience is marked by an invasion from beyond the margin of personal consciousness and the subsequent feeling of union with the Divine. At every point reality overflows our categories of description and everything that can be said about the experience.[2] Dr. Jones also indicated that in its narrow, exact, and historical significance mysticism is a doctrine of the union with the Absolute.[3] However, he used the term to cover a much wider variety of religious experience. Feeling that the negative way has been such a predominant element of historical mysticism,[4] and that it has led to a limitation of the union experience and the neglect of reason and history,[5] Professor Jones included within his definition of mysticism a group of spiritual reformers most of whom we would classify as spiritualists.[6] They represented a strong mystical emphasis but found their center of being in the Spirit rather than in the union experience and its consequences.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 6. [2] _Ibid_., pp. 7-10.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 11. Cf., pp. 26-27. [4] _Ibid_., pp. 12-14.

[5] _Ibid_., pp. 14-15. Cf., pp. 40, 46 f., 66 ff., 88.

[6] _Ibid_., pp. 96-97. [7] _Ibid_., p. 103 f.

[8] _Ibid_., pp. 71-75. [9] _Ibid_., p. 76.

Another very wide and comprehensive definition is offered by Dean Inge where he equates the entire range of the consciousness of the beyond with the raw material of mysticism.[7] Mysticism thus becomes the "attempt to realize the presence of the living God in the soul and in nature," or "the immanence of the temporal in the eternal, and of the eternal in the temporal."[8] Mysticism is an independent active principle; thus it must find instruments and symbols to express itself. So it has developed a speculative and practical system which includes certain presuppositions. Some of the more important aspects of the system are the threefold path of purgation, illumination, and union, the soul's possession of a faculty which can see and perceive things denied to bodily sight, and man's participation in Divine nature in some sense.[1] Dean Inge's definition has such breadth and comprehension that it is to be doubted whether it offers an adequate definition of the movement.

---

[1] Rufus M. Jones, Studies in Mystical Religion (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), p. xv.

[2] Ibid., p. xxiii.

[3] Jones, "Mysticism," op. cit., IX, 84.

[4] Rufus M. Jones, Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries (London: Macmillan and Co., 1914), p. xxv.

[5] Ibid., pp. xxvi - xxix.

[6] Ibid., p. xxix ff.

[7] Inge, op. cit., p. 5.

[8] Ibid.

William James considered mysticism a certain type of a state of consciousness peculiar enough and possessing sufficiently distinct marks to merit extended treatment. He defines the four marks of mystical experience as ineffability, noetic quality, transciency, and passivity.[2] Johanness Kühn in his discerning and thorough treatment of the relation between theoretical religious doctrines and the practice of toleration makes several observations concerning mysticism that are well worth mentioning. He points out that the mystic feels that basically he is already, as a man, one with God. Because of this, two main principles are held by all mystics. First, their mystic way which can be described as a stripping off of that which hinders the divine ground in man. Secondly, their common goal which is a divine union or absolute union between the soul and God.[3]

Of all the writers consulted who discussed the nature and characteristics of mysticism, Evelyn Underhill offered the most insights and provided the fullest account. In a number of works she outlined what she meant by mysticism and thoroughly documented her contentions with well chosen citations from the sources of Christian and non-Christian mysticism. The point of departure for the mystic is the ego or individual soul.[1] Claiming the existence of an Absolute and the possibility of experimentally knowing it, the mystic aims at a direct intuition or experience of that Absolute.[2] This is really an "expression of the innate tendency of the human spirit towards complete harmony with the transcendental order; whatever be the theological formula under which that order is understood."[3] Mysticism, then, is "the science of union with the Absolute," and "the mystic is the person who attains to this union, not the person who talks about it."[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 6-18.

[2] William James, The Varities of Religious Experience (New York: The Modern Library, n.d.), pp. 371-372.

[3] Johannes Kühn, Toleranz und Offenbarung (Leipzig: Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1923), p. 18.

There are several characteristics of mysticism that claim attention. First, there is a great gulf between the mystic's experience and the language used to express it; hence the necessity for symbols to communicate the experience.[5] Secondly, mysticism is personal, practical, and experiential and not primarily theoretical.[6] Thirdly, it is an entirely spiritual activity whose primary aim is to seek God.[7] Fourthly, the business and method of mysticism is love as an active expression of the innate tendency of the will and desire of man for the Absolute.[8] Lastly, mysticism entails a definite psychological experience that involves the entire self in its movement towards the vision of God and union with Him in a spiritual marriage.[1] This vision compels the mystic to sanctity that he might be worthy of what he beheld; so he passes through the threefold mystic path. Miss Underhill feels that in "the experience of the mystics who have left us the records of their own lives, the successive stages of this life process are always traceable".[2]

---

[1] Evelyn Underhill, Mysticism, A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness (New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1911), p. 5 ff.

[2] Ibid., p. 27 ff. Cf. Evelyn Underhill, The Mystics of the Church ( New York: George H. Doran Company, n.d.), p. 9 ff.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 86. Cf., p. 96.

[5] Ibid., pp. 90, 93, 94, 95.

[6] Ibid., p. 98.

[7] Ibid., pp. 100-101.

[8] Ibid., pp. 101-107.

Dom Cuthbert Butler maintains that the traditional historical meaning of mysticism has been handed down by the Church through the centuries, but the Latin Church first used the term contemplation and not mysticism. The latter was introduced into Christianity by Psuedo-Dionysius who wrote a treatise entitled _Mystical Theology_.[3] The claim made by the contemplatives received its simplest and most striking expression when Augustine said his mind in the flash of a trembling glance came to Absolute being or that which is.[4] Dom Butler then gives four modern definitions which are but various ways of expressing the same idea in different words and adds that all these definitions are in the terminology of metaphysics but that the Christian equates such terms as "Absolute," and "Transcendental Reality" with God.[5] He concurs with the judgment that the mystic is one who claims to have had "the experimental perception of God's presence and Being," and especially a union experience with God that is more than pyschological.[6]

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 107-108.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 109.

[3] Dom Cuthbert Butler, _Western Mysticism_ (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1923), pp. 2-3.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 3.

[5] _Ibid_., p. 4.

[6] _Ibid_., pp. 4, 17. Butler also holds to a twofold idea of contemplation or mysticism. Acquired contemplation is open to all devout and willing Christians who depend upon the general opera-

On the basis of the numerous definitions given, a few generalizations concerning the nature of mysticism might now be stated.[1] The attempt will be made to select those elements that seem to be commonly held as definitive characteristics of mysticism.

1. Mysticism appears in Christianity as a tremendous drive of the soul to experientially perceive God and to be bound to Him in a full union that transcends a mere psychological relation but retains the distinction between the soul and God; thus mysticism begins with the ego, the I, the separate soul in its search for the union experience.

2. The possibility of such a union taking place depends upon certain presuppositions concerning the nature of man. Christian mysticism has always held to at least the similarity of the nature of man and the nature of God. It expressed this through the doctrine of the imago Dei, or through the "spark" in the soul, the "apex of the soul," or the word "synteresis." Whether these portions of the nature of man were the actual divine ground of the soul, a remnant of man's nature left after the fall, or the potentiality of fallen man to be restored through regenerative grace makes little difference at this point. The important thing is that man potentially or actually is capable of gaining or being granted an experiential union with God.

---

tion of grace. Extraordinary or infused contemplation is due solely to the special grace of God and is really a super-added gift to ordinary contemplation. Infused contemplation alone can be called the spiritual marriage or passive union. Butler, op. cit., p. 282 ff. Cf., Dom David Knowles, The English Mystics (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1927), pp. 15 ff., 32 f.

[1] No attempt has been made to criticize or evaluate in a comparative way the different definitions offered. The purpose of the various definitions was to present a wide range of definitions from scholars of various schools that the reader might note the similarities and differences among these representative scholars and so be prepared for the definition offered in this thesis.

3. Mysticism claims that such a union is possible and attempts to describe how such an experience is given or attained and symbolically to communicate the effects of it. A mystic is he who claims to have had such an exalted union with God. For the Christian mystic this experience is either predominately Theocentric or Christocentric though it is hardly ever exclusively one or the other. The entire Trinity plays a part in the mysticism of all Christian mystics; but usually the experience tends to center about the vision of the Absolute and union with it, or it tends to center about the spiritual marriage with Jesus Christ the heavenly Bridegroom. While the Holy Spirit plays an important role, he is never more than the effector of the mystic way and the union experience.

4. Mystics are at one in either explicitly stating or implicitly exhibiting a so-called mystic path or mystic way that they have undertaken and continue to pursue.[1] Earlier western mystics did not specifically use the terms purgation, illumination, and union nor did they consciously systematize their mysticism through the use of those stages; however, their mystical writings clearly indicate the presence of the threefold path as necessary for the union of God.[2] A life of thorough moral training or healthy asceticism was an absolute prerequisite for the vision of God. Only the pure in heart can see God. The mystic was a moral athlete keeping in proper condition at all times that he might not

---

[1] Purgation, illumination, and union specifically defined and systematically applied to the Christian life is not a necessary mark of mysticism; nevertheless, all mystics in their internal development exhibit some such steps, which though not clearly defined or applied, play a necessary role in the attainment of union. The threefold path was adopted from Neoplatonism because it seemed descriptive of the experience the Christian mystic actually underwent.

[2] Butler, *op. cit.*, pp. 37 ff., 96, 142.

be found wanting for the great union experience, or so he might not fail to express properly the results of his experience in daily living. While asceticism was often looked upon as part of a growth in grace or the sanctification of life, its primary purpose was to keep one ever prepared for heavenly visitations.

5. The result of the union experience or heavenly visitation is inexpressible just as the experience itself is transitory. In his attempt to express his perceptions and experiences of vision or union, the mystic is forced to use symbolic language which never quite fully conveys his apprehensions. Furthermore, he must always begin his interior ascent or anagogical ascent from the world of his experience.[1] The transitoriness of the experience means that he must always begin anew either the via negativa and transcend sense and creature or the via analogia and ascend to the first cause itself. Thus the world and earthly empirical experience is that from which the mystic begins and to which he returns.

A Christian mystic, then, is a person who has had an extremely intimate experience of being personally united with God and who follows the threefold mystic path that he might repeat such an experience and exhibit the results of the union in his daily life. Any attempt to express the vision, union, or spiritual marriage fails to do justice to that which the mystic wishes to express. At best the mystic can only use certain symbols to convey the content of an experience that is not intellectually discernible.

The definition of mysticism offered in this thesis is admittedly more specific than the definitions usually propounded.

---

[1] J. Royce, The World and the Individual, I, i, quoted in A. B. Sharpe, Mysticism, p. 18. Royce has defined the mystic as the only thorough-going empiricist.

This seems to be of advantage for the study of mysticism as a historical phenomenon in that it offers more certain criteria to determine if a man really belongs to the godly fellowship of the mystics. Too broad a definition fails to do justice to mysticism as it has been practiced by admitted mystics down through the ages and only succeeds in diluting the meaning of the word to such an extent that it no longer serves as a definitive mark when applied to a person or movement.

There is a mystical element in many poets, philosophers, and divines, but that alone should not be sufficient to classify them as mystics. If the word Christian mystic is to mean anything as a designation of a specific type of believer,it must be definitive enough to distinguish that person from others who possess and exhibit similar tendencies but do not follow the specifically mystical life.

Baron von Hügel maintained that there were three basic elements in the religious life and that one of them usually predominated in an individual or in a certain group or order within the Church.[1] These elements are the historical or institutional, the intellectual and speculative, and the mystical or experimental.[2] In the deep complexity of life all three of these elements are present in tension often attempting to supplant one another but usually leaving some place for each other. A mystic might well be called the man who places the greatest emphasis on the mystical element in life and follows it to such an extent that it becomes the predominant motif of his existence and the actual means whereby he expresses his religion.

---

[1] Baron Friedrich von Hügel, The Mystical Element in Religion as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and Her Friends (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1927), I, 53-55, 65-70.

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 50-65.

The interrelationship of these various elements of life poses the question of the relation of the mystical way to the institutional and intellectual aspects of Christianity. This is a vital question for it is nothing less than the sociological significance of mysticism as a movement or of mystics as individuals. It is commonly thought that mystics have little use for the institutional and historical elements of the Christian faith. While a few examples of such an attitude can be found among recognized mystics, almost all of the mystics seem to retain their place within the institutional Church and have a high regard for the sacraments and ministry.[1]

What attitude towards the other elements of religion are we to expect on the basis of the nature of mysticism? It was indicated that mysticism first appears as a tremendous drive in the individual soul to experience a union with God. While it may be true, as Miss Underhill says, that mysticism is really anti-individualistic because it seeks not its own but seeks only to serve the love of God, it is also true that it begins with the individual soul seeking and ends with the individual soul partaking of an ineffable experience. Because of that Troeltsch can well say that mystical religion exhibits simply "a parallelism of spontaneous religious personalities, whose only bond of union is their common Divine origin, their common spirit of love, and their union in God, which is the free and invisible work of Divine Spirit."[2] It is primarily individualistic and lays its basic stress on the relation of the soul to God. It is really incommunicable and so offers nothing sufficiently tangible to form a cultus of its own.

---

[1] Underhill, Mystics of the Church, passim.

[2] Ernst Troeltsch, Social Teachings of the Christian Church (New York: Macmillan Company, 1931), II, 744.

On the other hand there are several things in the nature of mysticism that make it a definite ally of historical and institutional religion. The fact that it feels the necessity for symbols both as a means to articulate the union experience and as one way to return again to the vision it once possessed, indicates that mysticism would not wish to transcend the sacraments and ritual of the Church but finds them extremely useful. To say that this represents a subordination of externals is beside the point for in the Church ritual and sacraments have seldom been looked upon as ends in themselves but usually played the role of mediators--of grace, of fellowship, of divine presence, or of the numinous. The fact that the vast majority of mystics found a place for the sacraments of the Church should not be quickly discounted or immediately judged a weakening of the sacramental system because of mystical interpretation.[1]

Another interesting aspect of the relation of mysticism to the institutional aspect of religion is the fact that it usually caused so little trouble for the hierarchy. This is partially due to the fact that the hierarchy saw that mysticism was always kept well in bounds. But that does not give a complete picture of mysticism and institutionalism. The fact that mysticism is primarily individualistic and that its nature is not sufficiently tangible normally to provide a basis for a sect or for a cult means that it usually arises within the Church and stays within the Church. To the extent that it succeeds in awakening the indifferent and vitalizing dead forms by adopting them as living symbols, it strengthens the institution of which it is a part. To the extent that it clashes with an institution's unwillingness to be enlivened, it operates against the institution of which it is a part. Holding to the conception of the union of God as all important yet transitory and incommunicable, mysticism needs and uses the institution within which it arises.

---

[1] von Hügel, op. cit., I, 113-116. St. Catherine of Genoa partook of the Eucharist every day after her initial mystical experience. Evelyn Underhill, Mysticism, p. 435 relates that St. Catherine of Sienna communed with such fervor that often she immediately passed into a state of ecstasy. Cf., Underhill, Mystics and the Church, pp. 21, 24, 149, 163, 166, 244, 252, for mystics and the sacraments.

It appears that two alternatives usually comfort the mystic in his relation to the Church, sacraments, and hierarchy. According to the nature of mysticism itself either alternative is a legitimate deduction. The fact that the history of mysticism exhibits both fervent mystical members of the Church and indifferent mystical members of the Church makes the historian suspicious of the fact that the nature of mysticism itself contains principles leading to both attitudes. That being the case it is difficult to generalize on mysticism and its sociological consequences.

Insofar as their sociological consequences are concerned what is important in the mystics is not so much the mystical principles they hold in common but their personal attitude towards the Church from within which they arise and act. It is not possible for a mystic to be completely indifferent to the historical and institutional elements of religion, and he cannot reject them altogether. Rather, he usually accepts them as an integral part of his religious life to be aids on the way to union or the area within which to express the results of the union experience.

Whether the mystic is a Roman Catholic mystic, a Puritan mystic, a nature mystic, a reacting mystic or acting mystic is more important for the sociological attitude and consequences of that mystic than is the fact that he is a mystic. But even more important than these distinctions is the personal attitude of the mystic himself. Certainly the fact that a man is a Puritan mystic will in some way influence his relation to sociological relationships, but it will not guarantee his possessing a specific attitude.

The basic question to be asked about a mystic's attitude towards the historical and institutional elements of religion is what answer did he give as an individual and how did he relate it to his mysticism. It is impossible to classify him simply on the basis of his being a mystic. Once the basic question has been answered then one can ask the second basic question concerning his influence as a mystic upon the group to which he belongs. Does his total religious viewpoint add, detract, oppose, or supplement those elements of his Church's actions and attitudes which are of particular sociological significance?

In this monograph the problem will be the mysticism of Sir Francis Rous and its relation to Puritan piety and ethic. The question might well be, if Rous is proved to be a mystic what effect did his mystical theology have upon his Puritanism, and how did he as a Puritan mystic react to those Puritan emphases which were of particular sociological significance?

Having offered a working definition of mysticism and a mystic and having sought to determine the sociological consequences of the mystics we shall now attempt to offer a working definition of "spiritualism," its sociological consequences, and its differences from mysticism.

The basic definition of "spiritualism" is somewhat easier than that of mysticism, but there are many more subtypes and complicated wings in "spiritualism." It takes four or five principles or characteristics adequately to define mysticism, but there is one basic factor that defines spiritualism and sets it off from mysticism. That factor is the prominence and central place of the person of the Holy Spirit in the thought of the movement. Eric Seeberg distinguishes between mysticism and spiritualism on the basis of a Geistgedanke in the latter.[1]

Johannes Kühn states that the spiritualist lives in the fulness of the presence of the divine essence which God as Spirit has poured out over the world.[2] There is a radical cleavage between the natural world and "totally other" spiritual world. The Spirit produces and extends his own kingdom, the strength and might of external force are of no use.[3] The important thing is not the vision of God, the spiritual marriage or the union, but for the spiritualist the deciding factor in the religious life is the spiritual rebirth through the baptism of the Spirit.[4]

Casper Schwenckfeld might well be called the prince of the sixteenth century spiritualists. He exhibits those distinctive elements of spiritualism that were constantly to reappear in later Continental and British spiritualists. Basic to his whole religious outlook was the operation of the Spirit.[5] His main concern in life was not the theoretical enunciation of a systematically formulated theology but a practical concern for religion and its relation to every side of existence.[6] Life lived in the Spirit in obedience to Christ was the aim of all his exhortations and correspondence.[1]

---

[1] Eric Seeberg, "Der Gegensatz zwichen Zwingli, Schwenckfeld, und Luther," R. Seeberg Festschrift (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1929), I, 157.

[2] Kühn, op cit., p. 17. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

[5] Joachim Wach, "Caspar Schwenckfeld, A Pupil and Teacher in the School of Christ," The Journal of Religion, XXVI (January, 1946), 4-5.

[6] Ibid., p. 10.

Because of the vast importance given to the Holy Spirit in the Christian life, Schwenckfeld exhibited certain attitudes towards the sacraments, the Church, scripture, and faith. In all such elements of the Christian life the Spirit was the predominant and important factor while the externals were actually subordinated. Man has a double nature, external and internal and God operates on man in a twofold way, through the spiritual inner word and the external signs or symbols.[2] Faith does not come in by the outer word but is the direct result of the operation of God's Spirit.[3] The Scriptures are sealed inwardly and outwardly, and only the Spirit of Christ opens their secrets unto those reborn of God.[4] They are intended as aids for the operation of the Spirit.

Sacraments have a relative value in that they point to something else, but they are not the things or vehicle of which they are the sign. God, himself, must touch man in his innermost being without any mediating earthly pictures, ceremonies, creatures, or sacraments.[5] Hence the sacraments were never absolutely necessary for any spiritualist. Schwenckfeld at one time advocated "Stillstand" or the suspension of the use of the Eucharist until people properly understood it and practised it according to the will of the Lord which would be fully revealed through the Spirit.[6]

Schwenckfeld also believed in the possibility of perfection in this life. Perfection does not come suddenly, and some who are possessed by the Spirit do not pass beyond the stages of beginning and growth of the Christian life.[1] Those living in the Spirit are transformed into an inward likeness of Christ which eventuates in moral perfection insofar as it is possible in this life.[2] While this short exposition of Schwenckfeld's beliefs hardly does justice to his intense piety, irenic spirit and wide range of interests, it does succeed in showing the basic importance of the Holy Spirit in his life and thought and the consequences of that emphasis for certain Christian doctrines.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[3] *Ibid.*, Cf. p. 25.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 14. Cf., Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, p. 80 ff.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 67 f. Cf., Wach, "Caspar Schwenckfeld," *op. cit.*, p. 24.

There were a number of spiritualists in sixteenth century Germany who exhibited similar ideas to those of Caspar Schwenckfeld.[3] While all did not agree on such points as the extent of man's corruption or the condition of man's will, they were unanimous in preaching the centrality of the operation of the Holy Spirit, the existence of two realms, the spiritual or invisible and the external or visible, and they all held a similar view of externals. Spiritualists always held one of three attitudes towards externals, and these three were basically one because of their common source in the emphasis placed upon God's Spirit. The externals of religion were often so subordinated to the place of the Spirit that they were really of little importance or were in fact matters indifferent. Another attitude might well spiritualize them entirely and do away with all externals. Or, finally, externals such as sacraments, verbal prayer, church organization, and an ordained ministry might be completely suspended until the Holy Spirit reveals fresh forms. At heart all three of these have a common basis--the supreme importance of the Spirit and of the spiritual realm of life.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 17.

[2] Jones, Spiritual Reformers, pp. 76 ff.

[3] Ibid., pp. 17 ff., 31 ff., 46 ff., 133 ff., 151 ff. In these pages Rufus Jones offers an outline sketch of such spiritualists as Hans Denck, Bünderlin, Entfelder, Sebastian Franck, Schwenckfeld, Valentine Weigel, and Jacob Boehme, a mystic.

In seventeenth century England spiritualism appeared at the beginning of the era and burst into full bloom during the Commonwealth and Protectorate and found a permanent embodiment in the Quaker movement. It exhibited a variety of tendencies but was at one in its emphases upon the place and the importance of the Holy Spirit. A number of men such as Sir Harry Vane, Josiah Spriggs and others completely subordinated externals to the Spirit and could have suspended them at any time with no appreciable loss in their religious lives.[1] Others, such as the Seeker group, actually suspended the sacraments and formed no definite church organization but waited upon the Spirit of the Lord to reveal new forms.[2] Another, more radical group of spiritualists transcended all external worship, sacraments, and organization and maintained that they had found true worship as revealed to them by the "power from on high" the operation of the Holy Spirit. William Dell, Thomas Collier, and William Erbury are the best representatives of this type.[3]

It is evident that the movement designated as spiritualism was widespread and influential. The problem is to distinguish between it and mysticism and to discuss the value of such a distinction. Before proceeding to the distinction, it would be well to justify its necessity. Continental authors have been given to such distinctions but have seldom made clear the exact points of difference.[1]

---

[1] Sir Harry Vane, Junior, The Retired Man's Meditations . . . . . (London: R.W. for T. Brewster, 1655). Vane, Epistle General to the Mystical Body of Christ (London, 1662).

[2] Jones, Studies in Mystical Religion, p. 449 ff. Cf. Rufus M. Jones, Mysticism and Democracy In The English Commonwealth (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), pp. 58- 104.

[3] Johnson, op. cit., passim.

The reason for such a distinction appears twofold. First, it involves the same principle as that advocated for a sufficiently narrow definition of mysticism.[2] Even though spiritualism contains a large element of the mystical tendency, if it does not fit into a definition which does justice to mysticism, then it is not fair either to mysticism or spiritualism, as types of religious experiences evidenced in history, to confuse or equate the two.

Secondly, the task of the historian is to portray as accurately as possible the development of the present out of the past. The clearer he makes his distinctions between similar movements the more accurately he will be able to understand the place, source, and direction of the movements and so give a more correct picture of a total scene or era. If the evidence of history shows that in spite of certain similarities between mysticism and spiritualism there were several basic variations that eventuated in a difference of attitude towards certain important questions, then it behooves the historian to do justice to the variations as well as the similarities. Only by distinguishing the two movements will justice be done to the "genius" of both and will an accurate description of their source, direction, and influence be proposed. Less is to be gained by equating them because of similarities than is to be accomplished by differentiating because of important dissimilarities.

---

[1] Johannes Kühn, *op. cit.*, in an exceedingly well balanced and discriminating work comes closest to offering a satisfactory classification, but it is done primarily with regard to the problem of toleration. Heinrich Bornkamm, "Mystik, Spiritualismus und die Anfänge des Pietismus in Luthertum," *Vorträge der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen*, 44 Folge (Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1926), pp. 10, 11, 12, 16, is really unsatisfactory in his typology and fails to present adequate criteria to distinguish between the types he presents. Erich Seeberg, *Gottfried Arnold* (München: Lanzen und Müller, 1934), pp. 1-13, offers several of his usual penetrating insights, and in his "Der Gegensatz zwischen Zwingli, Schwenckfeld, und Luther," *op. cit.*, I, 157, he conclusively shows that it is a "*Geistgedanke*" that is the distinguishing mark of a spiritualist such as Schwenckfeld. Ernst Troeltsch, *op. cit.*, II, fails to distinguish between the two types and puts them all under the heading of "Mysticism and Spiritual Idealism." British and American scholars following Inge, Jones, and Troeltsch fail to make a distinction between spiritualism and mysticism. George Johnson *op. cit.* indicated some of the different marks of the two but failed to define the nature of mysticism as the point of departure for his distinctions.

[2] See above, p. 14 ff.

What, then, were the basic differences? At first glance the similarities of the two seem far greater than the differences. Spiritualism has a definite mystical element of vast proportions. It feels a basic drive towards a union with God; it wishes not theoretical knowledge of God but an experiential certainty of His presence and operation. It too feels that a union of man with God is possible because of a divine element in man which is either a created imago Dei or a divine "seed" or inward "light." Often spiritualists speak of union with God in terms that sound much like the mystics. Almost all of the Continental spiritualists and some of the British were familiar with medieval mystical literature, but that was not their real spiritual food. It can be said with little hesitation that spiritualists are men who depend more fully upon the mystical element of the religious life than do any other men except the mystics themselves.

The differences between spiritualism and mysticism might be outlined in the following way:

1. While both express the drive of the soul for an immediate union with God the way they conceive of that union and the part it plays in their lives is of great difference. It is not

common for a spiritualist to dwell at great length upon the experience of the vision of God or the spiritual marriage. The two occur in spiritualists' writings but are never greatly emphasized or held up as things to be ardently desired. The union experience is thought of primarily in terms of the Holy Spirit and its substantial or essential presence in the soul of man. Rather than speaking of the effects of the visitations of the heavenly Bridegroom or the vision of the Absolute, the spiritualist dwells on the rich gifts bestowed by the Spirit on the reborn or those baptized by the Spirit. Their experience is Spirit centered rather than Christocentric or Theocentric.

Furthermore, if they speak of a union experience they never dwell upon it as the maximum experience to be continually sought. Once man has been reborn in the Spirit, it is important that he grows in the Spirit, but he does not seek mountain peaks in his religious experience where he tastes God in an experimental union that far transcends his ordinary dwelling in the Spirit. The important thing for the spiritualist is his membership in the kingdom of the Spirit and his whole life expressing that in worship and activity. A spiritualist is one who proclaims the superiority of the Spirit of God over all other reality and claims that he has been reborn by the Spirit and is living in the Spirit. A mystic, as was said before is one who claims to have experientially perceived God in a full union with him. Usually he expresses this as the vision of God or the spiritual marriage. It is the high point of his religious life which he seeks to repeat.

2. Spiritualists might implicitly or explicitly advocate the so-called mystic way, but it never plays a central part in their thought and certainly is not looked upon as a means of preparing oneself for a heavenly visitation or vision of God. The

center of their religious life is the free operation of the Spirit who leads them to truth and activity. While man must not offend the Spirit he need not follow any specific path to have a greater experimental perception of the Spirit. His object is really not to see God, but to be possessed of the Spirit; hence his asceticism has a different aim and exhibits no definite form.

3. There is something about the possession of the Spirit by the reborn spiritualist that differentiates him from the mystic. The mystic may believe in the perserverance of thesaints, as did Rous, but there were great troughs in the spiritual life when the heavenly Bridegroom was not present. The union experiences of a mystic were transitory. There was not that steady presence of the mainspring of the spiritual life. The mystic's life is one of alternating rhythm between ecstatic union and resulting activity or renewed preparation, but the spiritualist's life is one of a steady beat which may vary in intensity but remains ever certain.

4. Thus far we have outlined the main theoretical or doctrinal differences between the spiritualists and mystics, but there are at least two other areas in which dissimilarities are apparent--cultic and organizational.

Spiritualists always take one of three views towards such external manifestations of the religious life as cult and organization. Though indicated before, the three attitudes bear repeating at this point. First, the spiritualist can definitely subordinate such externals as preaching and reading the word, administering the sacraments, and ritual or congregational worship. He might not do away with such things, but he lets it be known that they are relative and could be dispensed with at any time. Secondly, he might be convinced that all external cultic practices are corrupt and no longer are of any use to the spiritual realm;

therefore he suspends their practice and awaits a new dispensation of the Spirit who will reveal new forms of worship and sacrament. Thirdly, a spiritualist might take the attitude that the new dispensation of the Spirit had already come to pass and that from henceforth all worship was to be only in spirit and truth. There were to be no external cultic practices of a formal nature.

When the spiritualist considered the organizational aspect of the religious life, he usually took one of the last two attitudes mentioned. Perhaps it was due to the fact that the orthodox Church bodies usually perceived the danger of spiritualism and relentlessly engaged in polemic and struggle with them that drove the spiritualists from even a mild toleration of those organizations to a total rejection of them. But it was not by chance that established bodies attacked them for spiritualists in their exposition of the Church, sacraments, and worship made it impossible for an institutional church to tolerate them within her gates. This was true even where a Church might contain a strong portion of the mystical element of religion.

Thus it was that spiritualists either rejected the ecclesiastical organization of their day and tried to allow the Spirit to build up his own Church or awaited the moment when he would usher in the new Church. On the extreme wing, spiritualism looked for the creation of no new visible institution nor even for a growing association of those called out of the world by the Spirit and living in love and unity. They abandoned all thought of an external organization and lived the religious life purely on a spiritual plane. Unfortunately for them, men continued to possess bodies and the consequent need of external fellowship and leadership, so the gifted young leader, George Fox, won most of them over to his Quaker movement.

It is much more difficult to indicate what attitude the mystics took toward the cultic and organizational aspects of the religious life. One thing is certain, mystics never fully transcended all externals and felt that worship and organization could be lived wholly on the spiritual plane. Furthermore few, if any, Christian mystics have ever reached the point of "Stillstand" with regard to the sacraments. On the other hand the majority of Christian mystics seemed to have found use for the cultic sacraments and ritual of the Church to which they belonged and seldom denied the validity of its organization and hierarchy. Never would a spiritualist fit so easily into the cultic and organizational elements of religious life.

Certainly according to the nature of mysticism there is greater room for the appreciation of the historical and institutional elements of religion. Previously we stated that the high point of the mystic's experience--union or spiritual marriage--was but a transitory experience. Having returned to his normal religious life the mystic seeks or waits for another such experience. That means the mystic constantly begins from the empirical self and the world, proceeds to the union experience or even to heightened contemplation apart from an actual vision of God, and then returns to the ordinary level of consciousness and historical existence.

All surrounding life thus has significance in relation to his goal. Either he aims to withdraw himself step by step from external life, or he aims to proceed on the basis of the creaturely to the successive anagogical steps on the way to union. Cult as worship and sacrament can thus have vast significance as it did for St. Catherine of Genoa. Even the hierarchy could serve as spiritual links in the affirmative way to the Absolute as it did for

Pseudo-Dionysius. True, cult and organization were not viewed as commonly understood by the rank and file church members or by the dogmaticians, theologians, and literally minded ecclesiastics. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that such an attitude did not try to suspend use of cult or institution or to totally spiritualize them to the complete exclusion of all externals. The mystic could never escape externals, he started from them and returned to them. His union experience was not sufficiently permanent, as was the conscious possession of the Spirit, to attain the spiritualists' attitude towards externals.

Finally, a word of caution. It is not to be maintained that some mystics were not largely indifferent to externals though they always found a subordinate place for them. The fact is that on the basis of the nature of mysticism a mystic cannot get away from externals, but he could just as easily be indifferent to them as subordinate factors in his religious life. The spiritualist always takes one of three attitudes towards cult and organization, and all uphold the supremacy of the spiritual to the exclusion or subordination of the external. The mystic might agree with the spiritualist in subordinating the externals but seldom leaves the Church unless forced to. Usually, the mystic finds an important place for the historical and institutional element in his religious life. What determines his attitude is not only his mysticism but apparently his own individuality.

## III

Puritanism is usually looked upon as a type of Protestant religion that is in complete disagreement with mysticism or spiritualism. In such a view there is no necessity of speaking of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism or of trying to determine at what points mysticism emerged from Puritanism. When it is treated primarily as a movement concerned with the historical or institutional and the intellectual or moral elements of the religious life, Puritanism can readily be shown to possess little feeling for the distinctively mystical emphases.

If one explains Puritanism as an emphasis upon the systematically rational and moral aspects of the religious life, the picture that emerges is somewhat as follows. An extreme ethical concern producing a rock-ribbed morality expressed in a rationally ordered ethic and essentially unemotional piety is the most conspicuous mark of the Puritan. His main goal in life is the stern subjection of all things in existence to the sovereignty of an all-powerful, omniscient God. The divine plan for man has been clearly revealed in scripture and is proclaimed in a divinely endowed institution. Those who have been elected by the eternal decree of God are placed in the path of the law as revealed in Scripture, and it is their duty to fulfill this law and thus determine the certainty of their election or the approximate condition of their souls. Such an endeavor exhibits an intense zeal for the fulfillment of the law in all aspects of life, but that zeal is channeled in the direction of an externally formulated moral code and finds its impetus in divine fiat.

Puritanism seen in such a light is really a caricature of a number of its most admirable traits, but it is a picture that can be readily drawn if one emphasizes only the intellectual moral element of the movement. It is that which has led to the denunciation of Puritanism as opposed to beauty and aesthetics in all of its various manifestations. Bareness of the worship service, the austere bleakness of the sanctuary, opposition to music, painting and the theatre, the seeming lack of interest in the pursuit of the fine arts or even ordinary recreation--all these have been charged to a coldly rational, unemotional, fanatically zealous Puritanism. Some historians have over-emphasized the other-worldliness of the movement to such an extent that one often wonders how Puritans saw fit to endure the world even for the glory of God. Whenever Puritanism was discussed in such a fashion, it was axiomatic that the movement was completely opposed to mysticism and exhibited no tendencies in that direction.

Another characterization of the essence of Puritanism often overemphasizes the historical or institutional element in the movement. It was not in vain that the Puritan fought for a more thorough reformation of the English Church in head and members. Cartwright and Travers disputed with Whitgift not on the question of the relative superiority of the presbyterian system over the episcopal system but on the question of the New Testament model church as over against the traditions of man. The ultimate test of all organization and cultic practices was to be New Testament practice and not traditions of men or the test of reasonableness and fitness. Even when the free churches developed out of Presbyterian Puritanism, they too claimed an essential unity with Biblical practice in their upholding the covenant as the center of the gathered church. Thus, the institutional element with a strong emphasis on its divine origin and with a continuing clericalism modified in certain important directions was a marked characteristic of Puritanism.

Though all of these intellectual, moral, and institutional-historical elements were basic to Puritanism, it is never to be forgotten that even in its earliest stages Puritanism was primarily experiential and emotional. It was a continual striving for an immediate relation with God that was part and parcel of the be-pursuit of the fine arts or even ordinary recreation--all these have been charged to a coldly rational, unemotional, fanatically zealous Puritanism. Some historians have over-emphasized the other-worldliness of the movement to such an extent that one often wonders how Puritans saw fit to endure the world even for the glory of God. Whenever Puritanism was discussed in such a fashion, it was axiomatic that the movement was completely opposed to mysticism and exhibited no tendencies in that direction.

Another characterization of the essence of Puritanism often overemphasizes the historical or institutional element in the movement. It was not in vain that the Puritan fought for a more thorough reformation of the English Church in head and members. Cartwright and Travers disputed with Whitgift not on the question of the relative superiority of the presbyterian system over the episcopal system but on the question of the New Testament model church as over against the traditions of man. The ultimate test of all organization and cultic practices was to be New Testament practice and not traditions of men or the test of reasonableness and fitness. Even when the free churches developed out of Presbyterian Puritanism, they too claimed an essential unity with Biblical practice in their upholding the covenant as the center of the gathered church. Thus, the institutional element with a strong emphasis on its divine origin and with a continuing clericalism modified in certain important directions was a marked characteristic of Puritanism.

Though all of these intellectual, moral, and institutional-historical elements were basic to Puritanism, it is never to be forgotten that even in its earliest stages Puritanism was primarily experiential and emotional. It was a continual striving for an immediate relation with God that was part and parcel of the believer's life. That relation was mediated through Christ, but it was a relation of the believer of God in Christ. The Puritan did not give mere intellectual ascent to a number of truths irrefutably proclaimed by a properly appointed minister of a divinely ordained institution. None of these factors were discounted in his religion, but what was paramount was one's personal conviction by Christ who was experimentally present in his word and sacraments. In addition to this there were several other elements in the Puritan faith which were susceptible of continuation in the direction of mysticism or spiritualism. They were its other-worldliness, its emphasis upon love to God and to neighbor, and its doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

The fact that spiritualism and mysticism did emerge from Puritanism is abundantly demonstrated by the activities and writings of such seventeenth century Puritans as Francis Rous, John Everard, Giles Randall, Peter Sterry, and by such groups as the Seekers, the Happy Finders, the Ranters, and above all George Fox and his Quakers. The student of this period is faced with an outburst of mystical and spiritualist activity that is little short of astonishing.[1]

There are two ways to account for this phenomenon. One is to attribute it to the incursion of foreign theology through various tracts or persons that came to English shores. The other is to look for a gradual shift within Puritanism itself or for certain legitimate Puritan emphases that were extended in a mystical direction by certain men. Naturally the influence of Henry Nicholas,

---

[1] Jones, Mysticism and Democracy, passim; Jones, Studies in Mystical Religion, pp. 428-500; Jones, Spiritual Reformers, pp. 208-349; Geoffrey F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), p. 146 ff.; W. S. Hudson, "Mystical Religion in the Puritan Commonwealth," Journal of Religion, XXVIII (January, 1948), 51-56.

Hans Denck, Sebastian Franck, and Jacob Boehme is not to be discounted; however, men such as Francis Rous and Peter Sterry moved into mysticism not through the influence of near contemporary Continental thinkers and movements but through Puritanism itself bolstered by reading such men as Plato, Augustine, Gregory and Bernard--all of whom had been available to Puritans at all times.

Professor W. S. Hudson has indicated that the early impetus to the mystical tendency in Puritanism was to be found in that element of the Puritan movement which emphasized the immediacy of God as personally experienced by the believer. Lewis Bayly's Practice of Piety was one of the first full formulations of such a tendency, and the saintly Richard Sibbes' sermons are saturated with illustrations of this emphasis.[1] Though one might call it a "new emphasis" in Puritanism, it was, in reality, only a reemphasis upon one element in Puritan thought which was heretofore greatly subordinated to the moral and institutional elements of the movement. A closer scrutiny of those elements in Puritan thought which tended towards mysticism and spiritualism and which were emphasized by men such as Lewis Bayly and Richard Sibbes, will be extremely helpful in aiding one to account for the emergence of mysticism and spiritualism out of seventeenth century Puritanism.

First, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, not as theoretically maintained by Puritan divines but as practically preached and expounded, was the source of radical developments within the movement and served to encourage spiritualism and mysticism. Dr. Geoffrey Nuttall has demonstrated that a concern for the practical implications of the doctrine is what marked Puritans.[2] The practical implications for faith and experience are evident in the discussions concerning the operation of the Spirit and the word, the Spirit and the sacraments, the witness of the Spirit and its tests, the Spirit and toleration, and the Spirit and fellowship.[1] It was the preaching of Richard Sibbes that directed Puritan attention to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.[2] His sermons abound with references to not grieving the Spirit or to striving for the possession of the Spirit. A passage indicative of his emphasis was his exhortation that "if we would have the Spirit of God, let us attend upon the sweet promises of salvation, upon the doctrine of Christ; for together with the knowledge of these things, the Holy Ghost slides and insinuates and infuseth himself into our souls."[3] It was but a short step from such preaching to the claim by later "saints" that they were possessed by the Spirit and worshiped only in spirit and truth.

---

[1] Hudson, "Mystical Religion in Commonwealth," op. cit., p. 53.

[2] Nuttall, op. cit., p. 7.

Secondly, Puritanism always emphasized the immediacy of faith or the extremely personal and experiential relation of the soul to God. This was somewhat similar to that drive which impelled the mystic towards a union with God. Both are basically concerned with the relation of the individual soul to God, and both believe that such an intimate experience is possible because man's nature is potentially or actually capable of that experience. Even the Puritan who views man as a sinner is aware of the fact that man is created in the image of God and is potentially capable of an extremely intimate relationship with God. That is not to say that this is mysticism, but it is an indication of a point in Puritan thought at which a man with mystical inclinations could take hold. That is precisely what happened in the case of Francis Rous.

---

[1] Ibid., passim. [2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D., Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. . . . . ed. by A. B. Grosart (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1862-64), I, 24.

The drive towards immediacy of relation with God is usually emphasized in its cultic aspects by indicating the Puritan dislike for mediatorial priests or too authoritarian a church.[1] This was but one aspect of Puritan individualism. However, the other side of Puritan individualism or drive towards immediacy is to be seen in its personal religious aspects. The intensely personal introspective nature of the movement was disclosed by its production of numerous spiritual diaries.[2] John Bunyan preached "what I felt, what I smartingly did feel."[3] George Fox knew Christ Jesus not by intellectual apprehension but "experimentally."[4]

A distinction was made between historical faith and justifying faith. One could not hold the gospel as a true story which happened many years ago for that would not be an effective, acting gospel.[5] Lewis Bayly advised man to "content not thy self with that formall Religion, which unregenerated men have framed to themselves instead of sincere devotion: for, in the multitude of opinions most men have almost lost the practise of true Religion."[6] Likewise, Richard Sibbes maintains that it is not sufficient to uphold an external Saviour but "we must have Christ as it were born in us, 'formed in us,'" as he is "in some sort begotten, and conceived, and 'manifested' in everyone that is a Christian."[1]

---

[1] M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago: University Press, 1939), p. 346; Ralph B. Perry, Puritanism and Democracy (New York: Vanguard Press, 1944), p. 364.

[2] M. M. Knappen, (ed.), Two Elizabethan Diaries (Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1933).

[3] John Bunyan, Grace Abounding, p. 276, quoted in Nuttall, op. cit., p. 8.

[4] Ibid. [5] Ibid., p. 135.

[6] Lewis Bayly, The Practice of Piety, Directing a Christian How to Walke That He May Please God (London: John Hodgets, 1615), p. 284.

Though all Puritanism exhibited a tendency towards immediacy, certain men did assert that aspect of the movement as over against the other usual Puritan emphases. The important thing to note is that such men affirmed principles that were fruitful grounds for the development of spiritualism and mysticism. Both Lewis Bayly and Richard Sibbes exhibited that tremendous drive of the soul that wanted to know God in the closest possible way, though they still fell short of the mystic's conception of union. Bayly says that "the ardent desire of knowing God is the surest testing of our loue to God, & of Gods favour to us."[2] He upholds God as "beautie and Perfection it self" whom one should make "the chief end of all thine affections and desires."[3] Man should taste and see that God is good for "he that hath not by experience tasted his goodness, knows not how good he is."[4] So, the object of the Christian life was to fervently desire a fuller experiental communion with God, and Bayly outlined a minute, precise program of daily living in meditation, prayer, and action that the Christian might more fully experience the love of God and continue on the road to a full fruition of union in eternity.

Richard Sibbes preached many sermons on the desire of the soul for a more intimate relation and fuller communion with Christ in this life. The title of one such meditation, based on Ps. 27:4, was "A Breathing After God." In it he says:

> There is nothing that so characteriseth and sets a stamp upon a Christian so much as desires. All other things may be counterfeit. Words and actions may be counterfeit, but the desires and affections cannot, because they are the immediate issues and productions of the soul; they are that that comes

---

[1] Sibbes, Works, V, 486; VI, 401.

[2] Bayly, op. cit., p. 43.

[3] Ibid., p. 69.

[4] Ibid., p. 66.

immediately from the soul, as fire cannot be counterfeit.[1]

Love breeds a desire for fuller communion with God and produces a joy in the heart that makes the Christian soul "pant after God." When the Spirit of God touches the soul it stirs up "dependence, confidence, and trust on God." So the soul "is never at rest till it rests on him."[2] Nothing can make man happy but a drawing closer to God.[3] Spiritual desire, enflamed by the Spirit of God seeks God in love and subordinates all things in existence to this one thing.[4] In fervency, perseverance, and importunity the soul seeks her Lord. Man desires to dwell in the house of the Lord that he might abide in Christ, "make God our house" and to abide in "God himself."[5] Again, Sibbes expressed the thirst of the soul for God in a sermon entitled "The Successful Seeker." He characterizes all mankind, each in its own age, as a generation of seekers. Heaven is a generation of finders, possessors, and enjoyers of God. But here men seek something they are wanting or lacking.[6]

Sibbes does feel that men are "finders" in some sense in their earthly existence. In the second of two beautiful sermons entitled "The Matchless Love and Inbeing," he dwells on the presence of Christ in the soul of the believer. In a passage that beautifully express this idea he says "and having got enjoyment of communion with God, shut the soul to other things. The comfort of his presence is a heaven upon earth, sweeter than wine, and above all things to be desired."[7] He closed that sermon with an eloquent plea for the believer to get Christ in him that the Spirit might reign supreme. Then the believer will have comfort, joy and confidence in this life and a sure felicity in death. The necessity of the presence of Christ is eloquently expressed where he exhorts, "I beseech you, therefore, every day examine whether Christ be in you, and in what measure he is in you; and labour to give him more room in your hearts."[1] His sermons overflow with yearnings of the soul's spiritual thirst for an immediate communion with God in Christ.[2] He is not unaware of the emotional gladness and joy which result from the relationship between Christ and believer, and he encourages the desire to grow in such felicity, but at the same time he views it as but a foretaste of heavenly gladness.

---

[1] Sibbes, Works, II, 219; cf., II, 220; VI, 98 ff.

[2] Ibid., VII, 69. [3] Ibid., p. 71.

[4] Ibid., II, 218. Cf., Ibid., VI, 99. [5] Ibid., II, 227.

[6] Ibid., VI, 124 ff. [7] Ibid., p. 410.

Lewis Bayly's Practice of Piety appeared shortly before the end of the sixteenth century, and it passed through numerous editions and was one of the most popular devotional manuals in the English language.[3] Richard Sibbes was active as an outstanding Puritan leader and preacher from 1610 until his death in 1635. He held the Trinity Lectureship at Cambridge until his deprivation in 1615. From that year until 1635 he was "Preacher" at Gray's Inn and from 1626 was also Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. He converted such men as John Cotton and Thomas Goodwin; he preached at Cambridge before John Milton, Jeremy Taylor, and George Herbert, and he expounded his Puritanism at Gray's Inn in front of such illustrious names as Bacons, Cromwells, Drakes, Fairfaxes, Sidneys, Staffords, and Veres.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 412.

[2] Ibid., I, 69; II, 58, 87, 125 ff., 215, 217, 233, 236, 238, 246, 451, 467; IV, 181, 191; V, 183, 320, 315, 316; VI, 100, 116, 387, 403; VII, 67 ff.

[3] It was also translated into Welsh, French, German and Polish.

[4] Alexander B. Grosart, "Memoir of Richard Sibbes," op. cit., p. xl ff.

Neither of the two Puritan divines can be classified as mystics or spiritualists. In all respects they were accepted as orthodox in theology. But both exhibit an affirmation of certain Puritan principles with a new vigor and with unprecedented selectivity. They were emphatic in placing in the foreground of their exhortations the tremendous drive of the soul to experience God in a personal communion of great intimacy. This is an emphasis in Puritan piety that is too often overlooked by historians of the movement who emphasize the institutional, intellectual, or ethical aspects of Puritanism. Certainly the works of Sibbes and Bayly offered fruitful suggestions and possibilities to those who went in a mystical or spiritual direction.

Thirdly, the moral consciousness and systematic legalism of Puritanism offers at least certain external parallels to the mystic way or to the spiritualists sanctified life in the Spirit. The Puritan led a disciplined moral life practiced within the framework of a special routine of spiritual exercises. There was a hierarchy of virtues and vices and all was subordinated to the service of the Supreme Good. Two answers have been given for the reason of the Puritan's extreme care in "spiritual bookkeeping" or close scrutiny of his total life in light of a certain accepted standard or path. Max Weber contended that the basic question agitating Puritanism was that of the certainty of election. The Puritan could help identify the elect by the measure of a type of conduct which served to increase the glory of God. Thus, the life of systematic self-control was a means to assure one of his election.[1]

In his work on the Tudor Puritan period, and upon Puritan diaries in particular, Professor M. M. Knappen has come to the conclusion that the Puritan sought not assurance for election, in his systematic ascetic life, but rather a right state of mind bringing emotional satisfaction at having fulfilled both his contemplative and active duties.[1] The mystic followed the so-called mystic path and a systematic daily life for neither of the above two reasons. He sought to keep himself ever prepared in loving receptivity for another heavenly visitation and also attempted to express the results of any union experience in loving activity. The spiritualist followed a life of mortification and of self-discipline that he might be a fit vessel through which the Spirit could work, for his greatest sin was to quench the Spirit.

---

[1] Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, trans. T. Parsons (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930), pp. 110, 114, 115.

At first glance there seems to be little in Puritan self-discipline either as to its goal or its method that is similar to the mystic's concern for self-discipline. But in men such as Sibbes there was evidence that he pleaded for a well ordered spiritual life not so much to prove election or even to bring a present peace of mind but more that man might grow in the image of God, that communion with Christ might be fuller and more intimate, and that God's love might be more fully exhibited to the world. The Christian life should be well ordered and fully exercised, because the Spirit of God leads man in no other direction.[2]

If one seeks for the motive that impelled the Christian to a life of watchful self-discipline and activity, Sibbes would say it is the Spirit of God and the love of Christ that constrains the believer.[3] The purpose of the regulated life is not to prove election but to respond to the love of Christ and to grow in communion with him. Love is then the basis and end of the ascetic life.[1] In one place he says, "beloved, can there be any greater incentive and motive in the world to sanctification, to express Christ and to study Christ, than to consider what favour and mercy we have in Christ? how we are justified and freed by him, by the glorious mercy of God in Christ?"[2] This mercy and love of God is like fire which transforms all things into fire like itself "so the love of God, by little and little, transforms us all to be fiery; it transforms us to be lovers."[3] Sibbes leaves no doubt as to the primacy of love as the force compelling the Christian to a life of action. He asserts that "when we speak of the love of God, we speak of love incorporate in our conversations and actions; not of an abstracted love and affection, but of love in our places, and callings, and standings, love invested into action."[4] He then elaborates this belief by illustrating its application in magistrates, ministers, and in all walks of life. Here is a totally different basis for the self-regulated Puritan life and the dynamic Puritan ethic.

---

[1] Knappen, Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, pp. 6, 8, 14, 16.

[2] Sibbes, Works, I, 65, 82, 83, 85, 87, 89; II, 11, 13.

[3] Ibid., pp. 58, 74, 87.

It is at this point that one can perceive a similar tendency to that of mysticism. The mystic also followed a well regulated, healthy ascetic life that he might be prepared for a fuller union experience with God. It was a great thirst for union with God that first drove him towards the spiritual marriage, and it was an ever fuller and growing love for the heavenly Bridegroom that impelled the mystic both to seek further heavenly visitations and to be active in love among his fellow human beings. Thus, love of Christ or God is also the ultimate basis for the mystic's self-discipline in a regulated life, in the mystical path, and for whatever worldly activity he undertakes. Unfortunately, many mystics failed to strike a proper balance between love in contemplation and love in action or failed to direct their activities in love into the everyday calling of the believer. As to spiritualism, Sibbes's sermons give evidence of being even closer to that position. Both speak of the Spirit in man as the dynamic force producing an ever expanding love for God and for mankind, so it is the Spirit in man that leads one to ever closer communion through a fuller possession by the Spirit and impells one to ever greater activity in behalf of God. Thus, Richard Sibbes's sermons evidently exhibit a strong mystical or spiritualist tendency that was to be more fully articulated in later Puritanism. It is interesting that he was often quoted by all types of Puritan thinkers and preachers in later English Puritanism.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid._, V, 182, 187, 189, 278, 315; VI, 55, 393, 397, 398, 399, 409, 412. Cf., ibid., I, 79 ff.

[2] _Ibid._, IV, 272. [3] _Ibid._, p. 194. [4] _Ibid._

Finally, both Bayly and Sibbes used certain metaphors and symbols that, though they have been the common property of Christianity, have usually been closely associated with Christian mysticism and have been looked upon as part and parcel of mystical theology. The use of such material is especially heavy in the works of Sibbes. He preached no less than twenty sermons on the favorite of all mystical books, Canticles,[2] and he also preached such sermons as "The Spouse, Her Earnest Desire After Christ," and "The Brides Longing."[3] One of his favorite metaphors to express the close relation between Christ and the Church, and consequently between the believer and Christ, was that of marriage.[1] It is the most frequently recurring symbol in his sermons when he is dealing with the union between the believer and Christ, but he always holds it fairly well in check by maintaining that the marriage is primarily a relation between Christ and the Church and only secondarily between Christ and the individual soul.

---

[1] Nuttall, op. cit., p. 14.

[2] Sibbes, Works, II, 5-195. The title for the series of sermons is "Bowels Opened Or A Discovery of The Neere and deere Love, Union and Communion betwixt Christ and the Church, and consequently betwixt Him and every beleeving soul."

[3] Sibbes, Works, II, 200-212; VI, 536-560.

In one particular passage of a sermon on Canticles, Sibbes expresses himself in language that reminds one more of Bernard or St. John of the Cross than it does of an outstanding Puritan preacher. He speaks of love and its effect on the soul in the following way:

> What makes us, in the midst of all worldly discontentments, to think all dung and dross in comparison of Christ, but this sickness of love to Christ. If our love be in such a degree as it makes us sick of it, it makes us not to hear what we hear, not to see what we see, not to regard what is present. The soul is in a kind of ecstasy; it is carried so strongly, and taken up with things of heaven. It is deaded to other things, when our eyes are no more led with vanity than if we had none, and the flesh is so mortified as if we were dead men, by reason of the strength of our affections that run another way, to better things which are above.[2]

Numerous other passages extolling the love of Christ, the indwelling Spirit, and the union between Christ and the believer, are indications of a new direction in Puritan preaching and piety. Sibbes also employed the Johannine figure of the vine and the branches to signify the union between Christ and believers, but the figure was never employed with the same frequency or thoroughness as that of the spiritual marriage.

Lewis Bayly also exhibited certain mystical tendencies in his pietistic Puritanism. The state of a Christian reconciled to God in Christ was in this life a growth in the image of God and a gradual sanctification.[1] In this world the believer is united to Christ by a mystical or invisible union, and in eternity the believer is united to Christ by the closest possible communion with God.[2] There man will experience an immediate eternal communion in which God will be all in all and the saint will behold the beatific vision and see God face to face.[3] The immediacy of experience in this life is but a prelude to the vision and union to come. That, too, while orthodox doctrine, represents a tendency in Puritan thought that is not usually expected. It could also be shown that these men frequently quoted Bernard and even cited Pseudo-Dionysius and Hugo of St. Victor.

---

[1] Ibid., I, 13, 23, 38, 40, 70, 79; II, 13, 23, 24 ff., 33, 58; IV, 192; V, 534.

[2] Ibid., II, 125-126.

[3] Ibid., VI, 401 ff., 410 f.

From what has been said in this chapter it is evident that Puritanism contained within itself certain tendencies which were susceptible of continuation in the direction of mysticism and spiritualism. While clearly recognizing the influence of Continental spiritualists and mystics upon Commonwealth Puritan mysticism and spiritualism, scholars should not overlook certain mystical tendencies within Puritanism itself. Later developments of radical Puritan theology were not merely reactions from an essentially hostile Puritan theology but were also genuine developments of certain basic elements of Puritanism that had not received a major share of attention.

The man who proved to be the first genuine Puritan mystic was Francis Rous. He was a contemporary of Richard Sibbes but outlived him by twenty-four years. Descended from an ancient family of Devonshire, he was born in 1579 the younger son of Sir Anthony Rous at Halton in Cornwall. When Rous was eleven years old, his step-mother, the widow of Alexander Pym, and her child John Pym, later to become one of England's most distinguished Parliamentarians, came to live at Halton. Among the distinguished friends and frequent visitors of Sir Anthony was Sir Francis Drake, the "sea dog," and Charles Fitzgeoffry, local divine and poet of some repute.

---

[1] Bayly, Practice of Piety, pp. 127, 129, 130.

[2] Ibid., p. 663.

[3] Ibid., pp. 69-70, 141, 143, 180, 181, 182.

In 1593, Francis Rous matriculated at Broadgates , later to be Pembroke College, Oxford, and he graduated A.B. in 1597. Charles Fitzgeoffry published his memorial poems on Sir Francis Drake in 1596, and the prefatory sonnet was written by young Francis Rous. Continuing his interest in poetry Rous, in 1598, composed Thule or Virtue's History a poem in two books imitating the master of Elizabethan poets, Edmund Spenser. Early in 1599 Rous graduated from the University of Leyden where he had studied law. By 1601 he was back in England and continuing his study in law at Middle Temple. Within a short time the poet lawyer retired to Landrake, Cornwall and began a period of study and meditation on theological problems. The first result of his retreat was published in 1616 and was followed by another treatise in 1618.[1] Both of these show that Rous had become a mystic deeply concerned with the relation of the soul as the bride to Christ the heavenly Bridegroom. During this same period, Rous had married and given issue to a son, Francis, born at Saltash in 1615.

In 1625 Rous emerged from his long retirement and entered the political arena when elected representative of Truro for the first Parliament of Charles I. He sat in every subsequent Parliament including the Long Parliament, and he was elected Speaker of the Barebones Parliament when he was seventy-four years old. He sat on every important committee on religion that the Commons appointed. In 1644 he was named Provost of Eaton College, Oxford, with the provision that he was not to vacate his seat in Parliament. His metrical translations of the Psalms were adopted by the Scottish Church, and they are still sung in English speaking Presbyterian Churches throughout the world. A close friend of Oliver Cromwell, Rous sat on all of his Councils of State and was made Lord Francis Rous by the Protector in 1657.

---

[1] See Appendix A for all references to Rous's poetry and treatises.

The amazing thing about this man is the complete reversal of the usual sequence of the meditative and active lives. In his early twenties he retired to meditate but did not produce a single treatise until thirty-seven years old. But even more amazing than the time required to produce his first treatise showing a definite mystical bent is his entering the active life after embracing the meditative life. He was in his forties before undertaking a public office, but once involved in the momentous issues of his age, he never ceased from activity until death claimed him in 1659. Even ill health could do no better than force his partial retirement at the age of sixty-nine, and he soon returned to important public posts.

Here was a man who emerged from orthodox Puritanism to become a Puritan mystic. He reversed life and spent his early years in meditation and subsequent years in activity. But even in the midst of the active life he continued to show his mystical inclinations. It was in 1635 during his enforced retirement because of Charles' rule without Parliament, that Rous published his most thoroughgoing mystical treatise, The Mysticall Marriage. It is difficult to determine just how long Rous had been working on this treatise, but it gives evidence of the same two concerns that mark several of his earlier treatises: the personal union between the

Bridegroom Christ and the bride soul, and the necessity of action as a result of the heavenly visitations. It was the crown of his mystical treatises and has not deserved the oblivion that it has received. In it he expounded a fervent emotional mysticism combined with an interest in practical activity that is rarely encountered in the vast expanses of mystical literature.[1]

---

[1] The Dictionary of National Biography (London: Oxford University Press, reprint, 1921-1922), XVII, 316-317. Daniel Lysons and Samuel Lysons, Magna Britannia (London: T. Cadwell and W. Davies, 1814), III, cxiv, 77-78. Daniel Lysons, The Environs of London (London: T. Cadwell and W. Davies, 1810), II, 3-4. Alexander Chalmers, The General Biographical Dictionary (London: J. Nichols and Son, 1816), XXV, 394-395. Mark Noble, Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell (Birmingham: 1784), I, 400-402. Anthony A. Wood, Athenae Oxionienses, ed., Philip Bliss (London: F.C. Rivington, 1817), III, 104, 466. Bibliotheca Cornubiensis, A Catalogue of the Writings, Both Manuscript and Printed of Cornishmen and of Works Relating to the County of Cornwall, ed. by George C. Boase and William P. Courtney (London: Longmans Green, and Dyer, 1874), III, IV.

# CHAPTER II

## MYSTIC AS PURITAN THEOLOGIAN

Having distinguished between Puritan mysticism and spiritualism and having indicated the tendencies and emphases within Puritanism which moved in the direction of those two elements of religious experience, it next becomes our task to outline the Puritan mystical theology of Francis Rous, one of the earliest exponents and finest examples of Puritan mysticism. Just a word should be said concerning the possibility of outlining Rous's thought in a systematic way. Primarily, he was not a theologian but a poet. This is said in spite of the fact that he wrote but a small amount of poetry.[1] The beauty of expression, the fervency of emotion, and the sentence structure evidenced by the Mysticall Marriage and the Art of Happiness earn the author a high place in the ranks of English mystical literature. Never one to draw fine theological distinctions or to elaborate a closely-knit logical system, Rous is most convincing and persuasive when he employs a series of metaphors or similies. Such being the case, it must here be noted that Rous sometimes falls prey to contradictions through the use of metaphors that do not always convey the proper distinctions necessary in holding certain concepts or doctrines.

This is especially true in his doctrines of creation and man. Being a layman interested in a deep mystical piety expressed in an active life in the Spirit, Rous often took difficult doctrines for granted but expressed them in such a way that they no longer stood for their original meaning. This must be ascribed partly to his own intent and partly to his literary predilictions; however, it is not to be thought that he was ignorant of theology. He was well trained, possessed a keen mind, and was extremely well versed in patristic and mystical literature.

---

[1] Appendix A.

His treatment of various theological problems always occurred within the context of a very practical interest in exhortation. Rous never produced a single treatise in which he set forth a systematic exposition of his conception of the Christian faith. The Art of Happiness comes closest to fulfilling that task, but it also failed to place various doctrines in a logical sequence or to indicate their interrelationships in such a way that would leave one with the impression of having reviewed a total system. Actually, it was a practical treatise on piety intended to expound his conception of the happiness of man that other men might be led to the same truth.

The concern for practical piety and an active Christian life was the impetus that drove Rous to publish his various treatises. In 1616 when he sent his first work to press he indicated his intentions in the preface by saying that he had gathered the "divers sparks of Holy fire, which issued from the Spirit that baptizeth with fire," that by their "united heat" they might "kindle a flame where is none, or to increase it, where it is already kindled."[1] One could proceed to quote from the numerous prefaces to his various treatises to show that such an interest prevailed from the first to the last work.[2]

---

[1] F. Rous, Treatises and Meditations (London: Robert White, 1657), p. 489. Hereafter cited as Treatises.

[2] Rous, op. cit., pp. 96 f., 217 ff., 283 ff., 613 ff.; F. Rous The Heavenly Academie (London: Robert Young for John Bartlet, 1638), preface; F. Rous, The Mysticall Marriage or Experimentall

Francis Rous was but a child of English Puritanism with his intense interest in "experimentall" divinity and "active" Christianity.[1] The Puritan's main forte was polemic and piety but not dogmatics. Such an interest and its consequent expression in forms other than systematic theology does not mean that it is impossible to construct an exposition of theology as held by various Puritan thinkers. Their polemics and exhortations had a theology commonly held as the presupposition of their persuasive endeavors. This can be described as Augustinian-Calvinism. Any attempt to outline the thought of any leading Puritan thinker will have to keep in mind this theological orientation. Thus, though it may be impossible to present a systematic outline of Francis Rous's theology, it will be possible to exhibit its main components as either expressions of or deviations and developments from Augustine and Calvin.

At this point the question might well arise concerning the development or changes that transpired in Rous's thought. If he experienced a substantial shift of beliefs or if he gradually worked out his position passing through several stages, any outline of his theology would have to take that into consideration. But such is not the case with Francis Rous; his first publication contains indications of the type of mystical theology that prevails in his later works.[2] Though we have no positive evidence, all known facts and indications point to the probability that he had gone through a period of meditation and soul struggle culminating in a great experience which sealed his determination to walk

---

Discoveries of the heavenly Marriage between a Soul and her Saviour (London: W. F. T. P. for I. Emery, 1635), preface.

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 32, 33, 68.

[2] F. Rous, Meditations of Exhortation of Reprofe: Indeavoring the edification and reparation of the house of God (London: I. L. for George Gibbs and Francis Constable, 1616). Cf. Rous, Treatises, p. 525.

in the path of Puritan mysticism.

One is led to this conclusion when in Rous's dedication of his second treatise, The Art of Happiness, one reads:

> I confess the outward shews of this world had so far transported me, that I was very unlikely to have made this kinde of matter the main business of my Time, but I took ship to go to Tarsus, even to forraign countries, and in mine own began to study of the Law, until a storm from heaven chased me away to the study of Eternity, wherein I have found so much comfort and assistance from above, that the encouragement thereof is to me in stead of a voice speaking in mine ear; This is the way, walk in it: And in this way I desire to walk as stedfastly, as bodily infirmity, and the necessary distractions of this life will permit, until my time shall be no more, that so I may pass immediately from the contemplation of Felicity, unto the fruition.[1]

"The storm from heaven,"whatever it was, probably occurred around 1601 when Rous quit the study of the law and retired to his father's estate in Cornwall. It was not until 1616 that Francis published his first treatise, and from that time on his concern and theology remained basically the same throughout his long span of life. Though the treatise The Mysticall Marriage is his fullest expression of mysticism, almost all his earlier and later treatises contain mystical emphases. Furthermore, the treatises show that in most respects Francis Rous, though a mystic, remained a Puritan in theology and ethics.

## I

Francis Rous's doctrine of God the Creator stands within the Neoplatonic, Augustinian, Calvinistic tradition. That is, it exhibits emphases originating in Greek thought and formulated in the Neoplatonic school, emphases which merged with Biblical conceptions and colored to a greater or lesser degree the theology of every important Christian thinker since post-apostolic times.

---

[1] F. Rous, "The Art of Happiness," Treatises, dedication. The treatise was first published in 1619 and was republished along with his other major treatises in Treatises and Meditations.

This can be clearly discerned in Augustine who produced a grand synthesis of Neoplatonic philosophic insights and Biblical doctrines of such vast proportions and depth of religious intensity that it became both the basis of medieval Roman Catholic piety and one of the main sources for the reformers' criticism and consequent destruction of the Roman system.[1]

It is interesting, but certainly not strange for any Puritan thinker, that Rous quotes Augustine more than any other single authority.[2] Though the influence of Calvin is evident, there are no direct quotations from or footnote references to the Genevan reformer. One of the points at which Augustine's influence is most apparent is Rous's speaking of God as light.[3] That immediately raises the question of a Lichtmetaphysik. The idea that God is light not in a metaphorical sense but is actually so in substance or in essence is the basis of an ontological theory which traces its history back to the time when man first began to speculate rationally on his religious concerns and on the problems of of existence.[4]

---

[1] A. Harnack, History of Dogma, trans. N. Buchanan (Boston: Little Brown, and Company, 1903-1907), V, 61-214; Karl Holl, "Augustins inere Entwicklung, "Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1928), III, 54-116; Anders Nygren, Agape and Eros, trans. P. S. Watson (London: S.P.C.K., 1938), II, 231-344.

[2] Perry Miller, The New England Mind, The Seventeenth Century (New York: Macmillan Company, 1939), p. 4 ff. Professor Miller has pointed out what many scholars have suspected for sometime, that Augustine exerted a greater influence on the Puritan mind than did John Calvin.

[3] Rous also quoted Pseudo-Dionysius, but his influence on the Puritan mystic was more in the nature of providing useful expressions, such as the circle of love, than in an actual influence upon his doctrinal conceptions.

[4] Clemens Baeumker, "Witelo, ein Philosoph und Naturforscher des XIII, Jahrhunderts," Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters (Munster: Aschendorffschen Buchhandlung, 1908), Band III, Heft 2, 357 ff.

The basic idea of the *Lichtmetaphysik* was that God as the first principle and source of all existence was light in his most essential and primitive being, and through participation in his light all other things in existence have their being and life.[1] In its long and varied history this idea underwent many modifications and readaptations as it passed from a material, magical conception to the most elevated spiritualized conception of the Neoplatonists. Eventually it worked its way into Christianity through Augustine and Pseudo-Dionysius to appear in such men as John Scotus Erigina, Albertus Magnus, Alexander of Hales, and Bonaventura.[2]

When Augustine was converted from Manichaeism to Neoplatonism, his former half-pantheistic, materialistic conception of God was replaced by the ontological conception of God as light and spirit. Nevertheless, the Neoplatonic doctrine of light was not fully adopted by him, but it was inextricably mixed with Biblical insights and definitely subordinated to them in at least two important respects.[3] Augustine held firmly to the Biblical conception of creation *ex nihilo* by an act of divine will. Creation was not, as for the Neoplatonists, a spontaneous overflow from the Fountain of Light or source of all existence, spilling down into ever diminishing levels of life. Furthermore, as a trinitarian, Augustine maintained the doctrine of light as that which exists as one, uncreated and undivided, a unity existing in Trinity. This was in contradistinction to Neoplatonism which actually conceived of three sources of light containing varying amounts of light. The nous and the world soul, sources of divine light for all lower stages of existence, were thought of as successive emanations containing less light than the primal source of light from which they proceeded.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 372 ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 372, 373 f., 377.

Just as Augustine differed from a thoroughgoing Lichtmetaphysik, so did Francis Rous stand within that tradition yet differ from it in several important respects. Those points at which he deviates from a systematic light emanation theory are really reaffirmations of certain basic Biblical insights. The fact that a man is influenced by the Lichtmetaphysik and stands somewhat in that tradition is not an automatic guarantee that his primary interest centers in ontological problems rather than in moral distinctions, and it is unfair to imply such.[2] Though adherence to such a tradition is of the utmost importance, of equal importance are those specifically Biblical insights that a believer holds in tension with a Lichtmetaphysik.

The first basic point on which he differed from a strict light theory was in his view of creation. He, as Augustine, held to the idea of creation out of nothing by divine fiat rather than upholding the concept of emanation which maintained a cosmological descent of light into matter or corporality.[3] In the latter view all things in creation contained decreasing amounts of divine light as they found their place on the descending scale of existence. Though Rous used the language of the fountain concept, he was not consistent in the application of it. He did speak of the world's possessing beams of glory and exhibiting the print of its Maker, but he never graded it according to the amount of light it possessed or according to its distance from the source of light as shown by its position on the scale of being. The material and the lower forms of light were not felt to be the last infused with light and the more evil because the more base or corporal. Following the Genesis story, Rous believed that the world was not one of the final results of emanation but was created before man for the service of man; thus it was not and is not evil in itself.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 368 f.

[2] R. H. King, George Fox and the Light Within (Philadelphia: Friends Book Store, 1940), p. 85.

[3] Baeumker, "Witelo," op. cit., pp. 357 ff., 368 ff., 370 ff., 398 ff.

The other side of his difference from a pure light theory is to be seen in his doctrines of the fall and salvation. This will become abundantly clear in the next few pages; however, the difference should be indicated at this point. The fall was not merely or primarily a cosmological descent of light into the prison of matter, but it was basically a volitional failure on the part of man due to his pride and unbelief. At this point Rous was again influenced by Augustine and Calvin and was a good Puritan. Furthermore, the weak point leading to man's failure was not that his spirit was embedded in matter, but it was that his will lacked the constancy of effort to attend to man's true end. The fall could not be explained purely by ontological considerations for the Devil, as an active power tempting and enticing, was a vital factor in the picture of man's moral failure.

Thus while holding to a conception of God as light lighting all things in creation, Rous modified it to such an extent by certain Christian insights that salvation and evil were not explicated in ontological or cosmological terms but primarily in moral terms. Salvation was not the operation of the light within purifying itself and freeing itself from base matter and retracing the steps of the cosmological descent in a corresponding soteriological ascent. It will be noted later that salvation is a moral process explained in terms of an Augustinian-Calvinistic conception of effectual grace and sanctification. The mysticism of Francis Rous, though it contained elements of a Lichtmetaphysik, was worked out largely on the basis of the usual Puritan doctrines of the fall, salvation, and the Holy Spirit.

In the Art of Happiness, Rous gives the most systematic and extensive account of his view of God and of man and speaks in terms suggesting a Lichtmetaphysik. He writes that God is a spirit of the highest excellency, wisdom, and power. Following a typical Platonic distinction Rous maintains that all things in existence are graded as to their excellency according to their essential purity or grossness. God, is then, most excellent because he is most pure of all being. He is "a glorious, single, uncompounded Essence" which is the cause, fountain, and father of all spirits.[1] Continuing his analysis of God as essence as over against God as person or will, Rous uses the same distinction between spirit and material or being and becoming to prove that God is most wise in addition to being most excellent. "Wisdom is a light," so the more a being is unbodied or is pure being the more it is refined and capable of greater light or wisdom.[2] Thus God being the purest and most simple essence, being pure being itself, he is also the highest wisdom. To prove this point Rous uses an illustration that succeeds in clarifying his point but serves to weaken a thoroughgoing light theory. The highest part in man, the incorporal, invisible, intelligent essence is an expression of spirit which is the work of the Creator. If that part of man is the purest and best, certainly he who made it is far more pure and spiritual than the product of his work.[3] Note the reference to the spiritual part of man as being made or created rather than emanated from the source of all life. Finally, Rous maintains that God as divine essence is the most powerful source and treasury of power in existence because he is the purest essence or pure being. This contention rests on the same Platonic doctrine of the distinction between being and becoming. Power is most "pure and absolute when it is least clogged with weight" or "massiveness." The greatest powers known to man are unbodied invisible powers such as the wind and the mysterious power that moves the sea and tide. So it is that God the most powerful, the most wise, is, as simple pure essence, also the most powerful reality in existence.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 10 f.

[2] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[3] Ibid., p. 11.

Indications of a light theory are to be found not only in Rous's description of God as essence, but also in certain metaphors he uses in his description of the Trinity. The glorious, eternal Spirit manifests himself to our apprehensions in three persons which can be noted in every creature. God the Father is the "great infinite Minde or Understanding," or "the first and radical Light," which begets a great "Wisdome, Thought or Word." Christ is God the Son, a "begotten or second Light, Wisdom and Conceivement of the minde or understanding," the image and issue of the Father. The Holy Spirit is a "Vertue and Power" which "breatheth or floweth from the Godhead" whereby "God loveth and enjoyeth himself, and puts in execution whatsoever he will have done for himself."[2]

The entire Trinity operated in creation. The mind or Father begat a wise purpose through the Word, wisdom, or the Son, and what he thus projected he effected by the power of the Holy Spirit.[3] In a sense then, Christ became the source of man's being. In one place Rous spoke of the relation between Christ and the creature in language which recognized the Word as the source of existence and which sounded much like a light theory.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 11.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 16.

[3] *Ibid*.

> Christ Jesus is all lights in one light, all glories in one glorie, all beauties in one beauty, all joyes in one joy. When he gave light, and glory, and beauty, and joy to the creature, he left the roote of light, and glorie, and beautie, and joy in himself. . . . and he is a fountaine, for the largenes unlimited, and for spring without beginning and ending. The dew of his birth is of the wombe of the morning, even of that morning which hath an everlasting rising and shall be free from setting, for all eternity.[1]

If Rous spoke of God as light or wisdom and used the metaphor of God as the fountain of light, how then did he conceive of the creation of man? Just as God is a Spirit and the "fountain" of man's spirit, so is man a spirit though a low and created spirit.[2] To explain how the spirit which is man is derived from the "fountain" of Spirit, Rous employs the Genesis metaphor of God breathing spirit into man.[3]

> I was first breathed from heaven, and I came from God in my Creation; I am divine and heavenly, in my originalls in my essence, in my character, and therefore my happiness must be divine and heavenly. For to a divine and heavenly essence, can agree no other but a divine and heavenly happiness.[4]

Such language sounds a great deal like a theory of light in which God as light breathes forth into man a spirit or light which is the very image of God. Man's being is of a higher and purer nature than creaturely things because his spirit is derived from the "originall and roote of spirits."[5] Thus, says Rous, man created in God's image has light in his understanding the light that lights all men in Adam.[6] It is interesting that for proof Rous here uses two Biblical passages that can easily be interpreted in the direction of a Lichtmetaphysik.[7] He also says, in one place that man "resembles" God not only in having an enlightened understanding and will but also in his substance.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 44-46.

[2] Ibid., p. 2. [3] Gen. 2:7.

[4] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 2. [5] Ibid., pp. 4-5, 42.

[6] Rous, Treatises, pp. 652-653.

[7] Jn. 1:9. I Jn. 1:5.

However, Sir Francis Rous did not pursue this conception to its fullest extent. He used these many expressions leading one to feel that man had a divine soul which was a spark of deity shed forth from the "Fountain of Light," but in the totality of his system the light theory was dominated by Biblical conceptions of creation and man. The overall impression left by his writings is that man is not a product of divine overflow or emanation but the result of a divine act of creation. At one point he even speaks of the dust which God turned into a body and the "soule which God made with his breath."[2] Certainly that is not the ordinary view of a genuine light theory. The difference is most clearly indicated when in the same passage Rous says there is more in common between that dust and the soul than between the soul and lust. In a pure light theory there can be no proportion between the dust or matter and the soul or spirit, for even lust is the direct result of being emeshed in matter.

While there are definite traces of a light metaphysics in Rous's conception of God and man, one still feels that on the whole his theology was typical of contemporary Puritanism. This is substantiated by a thorough investigation of his anthropology. His debt to Augustine and Calvin is evident in almost every treatise. The dependence upon Augustine is especially noticeable in The Art of Happiness. The structure of the treatise centers on an eudaemonism for the problem of the author is the true end of man. In his opening argument Rous assumes that all men seek their own greatest happiness.[1] The aim of the treatise is to demonstrate where men seek for their bonum and what their true happiness really is.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 17-18.

[2] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 25-26.

He begins by depicting man as placed within a universe that comprises a vast ordered chain of being on which scale all things have a purpose to fulfill.[2] Man bridges the two levels of creaturely beings and pure spiritual beings. Through his body man is kin to the creaturely and to the earth, but through his spirit or soul man is kin to the deity; thus, in man glory and humility are "married."[3] Endowed with a body, man was prevented from thinking himself God of the universe; possessed of a soul, man was prohibited from seeking his true end in that which stands lower than himself on the scale of being.

Earthly creatures were made to serve man that man's bodily sustenance might receive provision. Also, such creatures provide an analogy that the intellect of man might seek the cause which stands behind them.[4] Just as the creatures are to serve man, so is man to turn his back towards the creaturely and to turn his face in service towards God his true end. That which man considers his true end, he will serve in obedience.[5] What is to determine what shall be man's true end and vital happiness? How can man find the "one thing which is really and perfectly good" amidst "the infinite changes of things seemingly good."[6] Man cannot serve both God and mammon, but he must make a choice between earthly felicities and eternal felicity; thus man's trust must be placed in one truth only.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 1.

[2] A. O. Lovejoy, The Great Chain of Being (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), p. 67 ff.

[3] Rous, Treatises, p. 17.

[4] Ibid., p. 17, 500.

[5] Ibid., pp. 17, 19, 513.

[6] Ibid., p. 9.

Rous then determines to "seek out that thing which beareth these conditions: to this purpose let us search the length and breadth, the heighth and depth of Essences and Beings. . . . the Creature, and the Creator, God and the World."[1] Three tests are given whereby one can determine what man's true end actually is. First, Rous investigates the world of becoming to see if it can be the true end of man. Then, having determined that the world and creatures cannot be the true end of man, he proceeds to analyze the nature of man to find if it offers any clue as to man's highest good. Finally, by turning to Biblical revelation, he confirms his findings that man as spirit must seek his bonum in the Spirit from whence he sprung. In the mystery of the Sabbath which gives meaning to earthly toil he finds the answer to man's ultimate destiny. All earthly spiritual toil and growth point to an eternal Sabbath of rest.

The world and creatures offer nothing but vanity. They are not the fit end of the soul and proffer no stable happiness for the body. The world teaches its griefs, oppressions, imperfections, and wickedness by experience. The mind proves that one cannot be certain of one's riches, powers, and honors because all could be swept away at any moment. Finally, even if one persists in the possession of his wealth, honor and riches throughout his earthly sojourn, death "cuts them wholly from thee."[2] The earth and all within it is cursed, and man cannot find his blessedness therein.[3] The world and creatures provide but a transitory happiness at best and sheer misery and vanity at worst so "there remains only that highest Essence, the Cause and Fountain of all things, in whom Man may seek his happiness."[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 9.

[3] Ibid., p. 607.

[4] Ibid., p. 10.

In addition to the fact that the world and creatures could not offer man his true bonum, the nature of man itself was a measure of what the true end must be for man. Man was created in the image of God. God is light and wisdom; thus that in man which corresponds to God, such as enlightened understanding and holy will, is the imago Dei. Man had a "burning Lamp" and a"fountain of light" in his soul which was to serve as a guide to the understanding.[1] Brute beasts or earthly creatures have but a determined light which operates as instinct. Inanimate objects have no light of reason but follow a certain "moving power fixed in them." But not so with man who had a light to guide his understanding and the possibility of exercising judgment and will to incline one way or another. As long as man depended upon the source of that light which enlightened his understanding and will, man was living as intended.[2] Then the image of God in man looked cheerfully upon God whose image it was, and God looked upon the image in man and loved it because he saw his likeness therein. Of course, likeness breeds love, for like seeks out and embraces like.[3] Thus the image of God in man was like a little mirror or glass reflecting its creator and original.[4]

It is only reasonable that the highest part of man should enjoy the most excellent happiness of man. It would be foolish for the soul, the highest part of man, to find her end in that which is less pure than she; thus the soul of man being a spirit, she must find her true happiness in a spirit greater than herself.[5] Creatures and earthly beings are made to serve the body, the body is made to serve the soul, and the soul is to find her end and well being in that which is purer and better than herself--God. Rous sums it up in the following words:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 526. [2] Ibid., p. 495.

[3] Ibid., p. 659. [4] Ibid., P. 296.

[5] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 4-5.

> Lastly, the beautiful object of Man, must be the most agreeable object of his most excellent part. Now man's chiefest part is a lightsom, reasonable, and understanding spirit. Therefore that which can issue unto Man the greatest joy, must be a most wise, reasonable, and lightsome spirit; likeness, agreeableness, and harmony, being the foundations of pleasure; and consequently, the most excellent. Like, pouring into his inferior like, the most conformable, natural, and kindly joyes; from which ariseth an enjoying, even in perfection, contentment, and rest.[1]

While the above two tests indicate man's goal in life, there is yet a more certain witness to the truth. By the mystery of the Sabbath, God has revealed that man's treasure is in heaven where also is his rest and happiness.[2] Such a goal makes the miseries and sufferings of life endurable. It gives meaning and significance to daily labor and struggle.[3] Without the six days of labor there is no Sabbath, and without the Sabbath there is no goal or importance to worldly toil.[4]

Certainly such an incomparable and lofty happiness enduring through all eternity is a worthy end of man. In the midst of passing mundane vanities man would do well to pay heed to that alone which is necessary and of solid permanence.[5] Not only is this happiness and end of life the only goal of existence, it is also the only true wisdom and knowledge worthy of man. Man might be deeply versed in the wisdom of the ages and still be immersed in weariness and vanity.[6] He who would be a man of wisdom must be a discoverer of this true happiness for therein do all other wisdoms meet.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 3. [2] Ibid., pp. 18-19, 151

[3] Rous upholds the importance of labor and good works. Only through labor can man have peace in this life and true rest hereafter. Works of love follow a believer to heaven and become his blessing though they do not procure his salvation. Cf. Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 83, 91.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 550. [5] Ibid., pp. 34, 60. [6] Ibid., p.12.

The end of man can also be expressed as the glorification of God and the vision of God. This vision of God is one of light or of his glory. The greatest thing the soul can behold is "the Sun of the Sun, even that high and purest Light, which shineth upon the Sun and all other things that shine."[2] While the doctrine of the vision of God cannot be classified strictly as a light theory idea, it did nevertheless, usually find an important place in any such theory. The fact that Rous used such metaphors as the "Sun"or the "high and purest Light," to describe God is not proof that he had a systematic Lichtmetaphysic, but this fact along with his views on the essence of God and the origin of man's soul indicate that he was somewhat influenced by a light theory.

On the other hand, his doctrine of the end of man was the typical Puritan view. The chief end of man is God, and the chief glorying of man is in the knowledge of God; "therefore by the knowledge of God, is man's chiefest happiness."[3] These ideas that man's chief end is God and his glorification and that in the knowledge of God is man's happiness are found in Augustine, but they receive their fullest and most systematic treatment in Calvin. The Institutes can be understood as an attempt to outline a Biblical theology which would present to man the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ leading to eternal life. Every man who has knowledge of self is led by the facts of experience to acknowledge the reality of and his dependence upon God.[4] So, man cannot think carefully about himself without being led to think about God. But man cannot by himself have sufficient or true knowledge of God; thus he cannot have true knowledge of self or of God.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

[2] Ibid., pp. 35 f. Cf., Ibid., pp. 67, 90, 91, 153-157, 179, 495; Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 67, 188-189.

[3] Rous, Treatises, pp. 142, 561.

[4] John Calvin, The Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. John Allen (7th ed.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), I, i, 1.

The Institutes then proceeds to treat of these two problems, the knowledge of self as sinner and the knowledge of God as creator and redeemer. To know what God wills for us, what he offers to us, what leads to his glory, is to find the true happiness of man. Thus the true happiness of man consists in knowledge of God as creator and redeemer--knowledge which leads to man responding in trust to God's will and promises and to man ordering all of life that it serves God's glory.

In dealing with Rous's conception of salvation his dependence on Calvinism will be more fully indicated. There it will be evident that knowledge is absolutely essential for salvation, and that knowledge is conceived of largely in Calvinistic terms as the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ which leads to man's true happiness and to the glorification of God through service. At this point the only purpose is to show that Rous's treatment of knowledge, happiness, and glory as part and parcel of the true end of man stand in an Augustinian-Calvinistic tradition.

It is in his treatment of the fall of man that Rous's Puritan theology is most clearly expressed. There is little to suggest the influence of a light metaphysics at this particular point. In good Augustinian-Calvinistic fashion he held that man, in addition to an enlightened understanding, was created with a holy will set in equipoise and freedom. Man could continue to depend upon grace and remain righteous or refuse divine grace and fall from his righteousness.[1] The choice was between living as a true expression of God's image by remaining obedient and faithful to to God or living as sufficient unto self by following the light of reason apart from the light which lights all understanding and reason.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 652.

But man was not sufficient unto himself. Left with the possibility of choosing between the tree of life and the tree of death man's will lacked the constancy and support to make the right choice; thus man was overcome by him who exceeds man in cunning and power--the devil. In itself this freedom of will was an excellent privilege, but in man at the mercy of the tempter it "easily becomes a door into misery."[2]

In such a view God was not responsible for the fall in that he was not the direct cause of such an act of disobedience; however one can say that God was indirectly responsible in that he created man with freedom of will though lacking the stability and perseverance of grace necessary to stave off temptation. That he might be responsible man was created with a free-will, but just as certainly as he possessed that possibility of choice, he was certain to fall. Or, as Rous puts it: "For where God leaves the will free, this freewill will freely but certainly fall, and where it will certainly fall, by that certainty the certainty of the Decree passeth safely to his assured mark."[3]

Rous, following Augustine and Calvin as did most good Puritans, maintains a balance between the conception of man's voluntarily sinning and the unavoidability of the fall under the covenant of free will and general grace. God is thus left free to punish men for sinning and deserves all glory when he elects men to salvation. Not only is God free to punish Adam but also he is free to punish all the offspring of Adam. For as we shall soon note part of the punishment imposed upon Adam was a natural depravity which was inherited by all his progeny. Not just a man Adam fell, but man "in gross" fell in Adam."[1] The necessity of the heirs sinning came not from God but from Adam: so free-will and not divine will is to be blamed for hereditary corruption.[2] Rous sums up his conception of the fall and its consequences in these words:

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 175. Rous placed vast importance upon reason and understanding as the essential thing in man expressing the image of God.

[2] Rous, _Treatises_, p. 23. [3] _Ibid_., p. 138.

> Accordingly, God is unbelieved: the Tempter is trusted: the hand is reached out and the fruit of misery is devoured. The eating is most wicked, and the digestion most wretched: Lust as the juyce of this fruit entreth into the soul and body of Man: it obtaineth a conquest over the parts and powers of the Eaters; and tainteth them with a fleshly wisdom and a sensual knowledge.[3]

At the basis of the calamity was man's unbelief. This is good Reformation theology advocated both by Luther and by Calvin. The heart of the whole conception is that man placed in a position where he could continue to live in the way God suggested chose rather to listen to the tempter and sought an additional power in the tree of good and evil. Man was not satisfied with the happiness of the creature and through a choice attempted to gain that which would make him like God.[4] Thereby man disbelieved what God had promised him and believed rather what the tempter suggested.

The results of the fall were far-reaching and catastrophic. The image of God in man was defaced and actually reversed. No longer did man look to God as his true end, but man sought his God in self and creatures. As a result lust or concupiscence was set up in the heart of man as a new Godhead, and it became a new law written in the heart of every man. The will was no longer free in equipoise between good and evil, but it became bound to concupiscence which ruled supreme in man's heart. Furthermore, understanding which formerly enlightened the will and led the emotions became "pudled" and blind. Man was indeed in a radical new situation, and the results which affected Adam were not confined to him but were transmitted to all posterity. In this new condition man felt he could win his own way to salvation either through a modicum of outward help or through the operation of his own free-will. Before the fall man's will felt it lacked something and so ate of the tree of knowledge, but since the fall man has felt sufficient in himself; thus unbelief was wed to pride, and concupiscence captured the heart, understanding and will.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 660, 75.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 139. Rous emphasized that in a certain sense every man is his own Adam because if any other man would have been in Adam's place, he would have done the same thing. Man as the copy is no different from his original.

[3] Rous, _Treatises_, p. 23.

[4] _Ibid_.

Concupiscence or lust is the main root of sin, and it controls every man as it becomes a new God-head which replaces the image of God in the soul of man.[2] But this monstrous God-head is contrary to the essence of the soul and can offer man only misery, darkness, and death. The soul of man having been created by the Fountain of light it is "lightsome," but lust is all darkness. The earth can just as easily give light to the sun as lust can give life or light to the soul. Lust is not just an absence of light and so darkness,it is actually contrary to light and completely opposed to it.[3]

In order to illustrate the incompatibility between the soul and concupiscence, Francis Rous used the same figure that he employed to expound his intense personal mysticism--the marriage symbol. The marriage between a soul and lust can only be something "monstrous, as between a woman and a beast."[1] The result of such a union was disastrous. Man thought he would become like God and know good from evil, but in place of such knowledge man became a slave to lust. Rather than God's law as the norm for actions, concupiscence ruling in the heart of man became the new norm.[2] Instead of a new found freedom bringing joy and happiness, man became a slave to his lust "even an Egyptian bond-slave."[3] Echoing Plato, Rous says of lust: "O the wildness of Lust, which like a fed Horse, breaks over hedge and ditch, and will not be bounded but with Diseases, Death, and Hell; God hath given a bound and the bound is a Remedy for this raging Fury."[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 23, 577, 654, 658.

[2] Ibid., p. 600.

[3] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 21-23.

This unhappy marriage has its most catastrophic effects on the will and understanding, and at those two points the intensity, tyranny, and destructiveness of lust is most clearly evidenced. In the area of the will, man still feels that he possesses a free will because he notes that he can make choices by his own will. But man, born in sin and as a slave to lust, cannot see his true condition and argues only for a figment of his imagination and product of his pious wishes. Especially guilty of this error are the so-called wise men, the philosophers, and politicians.[5] Such men can see no necessity for grace because they do not understand their own state of bondage.

Rous went to great lengths in combating the doctrine of free-will. He turned to history for proof of the fact that man could not live by free-will. Man fell from the state of perfection when possessed of free-will and general grace; he repeated his performance under the law of nature before the great flood; then with the addition of the law the Jews still could not stand free will.[1] Rous also turned to the fathers of the Church and to the Thirty-Nine Articles to prove the doctrine of predestination, election, and bondage of the will. In Testis Veritatis to substantiate his contention, he referred to Augustine, Bradwardine, Aquinas, Luther and many others.[2] But the doctrine of free will had more than doctrinal significance in seventeenth century England, it had extremely important political consequences in that only two groups upheld it, so-called Laudian Arminians and the Roman Catholics. Both were felt to be a danger to England.

---

[1] _Ibid._, pp. 32 ff.

[2] Rous, _Treatises_, p. 20.

[3] _Ibid._, pp. 298, 516.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 238

[5] _Ibid._, pp. 672, 678.

The other area in which the rule of concupiscence was evident was that of the understanding. The function of the understanding was to direct the will and affections by making known the correct goal that the other faculties might be drawn to the good and will it; however, the understanding had been "pudled" by the fall and was dimmed by the passions born of concupiscence.[3] This double hindrance was the result of the fall and prevented the understanding from functioning properly in relation to the will and affections. To describe this Rous used a figure, taken from Scripture, which was to become famous with the Cambridge Platonists, the understanding "is as a Candle put out, or covered with a Bushel." As a result the will and affections no longer functioned in relation to reason or understanding but had become "slaves of Passion and perturbation."[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 663 ff., 452.

[2] Francis Rous, Testis Veritatis, The Doctrine of King James our late Soveraigne of famous Memory of the Church of England Of the Catholicke Church Plainly showed to bee ONE in the points of Predestination, Free-Will, Certainty of Salvation With a discouery of the Grounds both, Naturall and Politicke of Arminianisn (London: by I.W., 1626). Rous, "The Great Oracle. . . ." Treatises, pp. 651-679.

[3] Ibid., p. 109.

[4] Ibid., pp. 83, 45.

The importance of the catastrophe becomes doubly apparent in view of the exalted position Rous gave to the soul or reason of man. At times he equates the two and takes the further step of identifying them with the imago Dei. Concupiscence or lust is as a wine that poisons the very soul and reason of man so the most excellent part of man, the image, is all but defaced. This leaves man as "base and dishonerable as the Beasts." Such sin is no less than murder "for it kills that which is indeed the man, even Reason and Understanding." Note here the reoccurring emphasis on reason as the distinguishing characteristic of man. The other side of the picture is the insistence that since the fall reason is perverted and unreliable. This leads Rous to define man as "a piece of reasonable misery." "He hath reason to fore-see misery, and so to take it to his heart: when reason cannot prevent it, reason to fore-see death, but not to avoid it."[1]

The resulting shortcoming of man's understanding or wisdom is a deep-seated, corruption or perversion. Rous says: "The flesh lyeth on the soul, as a finger on the strings of a Lute, and makes it to sound, speak, and to be wise according to the nature of that which stoppeth it."[2] This is the principle which underlies his view of the inability of philosophy to ascertain correctly man's plight and to prescribe a proper remedy. The following excerpt is given to exhibit Rous's rational analysis, condemnation of philosophy, and his catchy phrases. In a treatise where he extols the superiority of Christian doctrine over philosophy he notes:

> Therefore most fitly does this doctrine begin with the first estate of man, and the loss thereof, even a created perfection, and a purchased corruption: A learning, which all

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 175, 48, 540.

[2] Ibid., p. 540. This is one of several places where Rous illustrates a point by turning to music.

> Philosophy could never reach. For she is the childe of man, and therefore cannot tell the beginning of her own Father. For man was before she was, yea man was lost, before she was found, and so she which was since corruption, cannot tell how that corruption came which was before her; much less can she speak of that perfection which was again before this corruption. But the truth is, bad she finds us, and not knowing the cause, she can never find the cure; and therefore as she found us, so she leaves us miserable.[1]

Philosophy, then, is powerless to give an adequate picture of man or to offer a solution for his ills. Rous indicates that in the capacity of the philosopher, natural man has attempted to heal the corruption of man by appealing to the use of reason "the ancient Image of his Maker," but in this very act he overlooks the fact that reason itself is corrupt; thus the remedy is mere "verbage" which is not a "fit expiation for a guilt of so high a nature," nor "an expurgation of so foul a corruption."[2]

The problem of the transmission of lust receives a most interesting treatment at Rous's hands. What he meant by lust or concupiscence was not something primarily physical connected with man's flesh, but a principle which controlled the whole man, mind, body, and soul; however, he used a substance metaphor to explain how this principle entered the heart of mankind. He spoke of the tree of death as possessing a certain "quality" which carried with it "a spiritual drunkeness" or as possessing a "venom" or "juyce" from which issued a "blinde lust and concupiscence, which blotted out the Image of God in the soul, by which we once looked unto

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 13. Cf. ibid., p. 107-108: "For the Philosopher hath got a Soul he knows not how, with some measure of reason in it (but I must tell him terribly ruined and degenerate) and having got it he huggs it, looks on it, and sets his rest and contentment in the sight and operation of it, and compares it onely with it self; but the soul having a derivative goodness, the true tryer and touchstone thereof must be the primitive goodness; Therefore they do foolishly that examin their souls by their souls, and their reasons by their reasons, especially in this state of corruption, for if the soul be crooked, it cannot serve for a Rule to rectifie it self."

[2] Rous, Treatises, pp. 24-25.

God."[1]

On the other hand in indicating both the source of man's fall into sin and the state which resulted, Rous used terminology that indicated not a physical or substantial medium but rather a spiritual principle or state. Man's fall into sin was caused by a volitional act of disbelief and pride in which he turned from God as his true end and happiness that he might seek his own end and felicity. The will felt it lacked something for its full happiness and distrusting God's promises listened to the tempter and sought that lack in the forbidden tree. The result was that man lost all his privileges given by God. Driven from the sacrament of the tree of life, man became subject to illness and death; turning his face from God, man all but destroyed the image and in place of understanding, will and affections turned towards God there emerged concupiscence as the controlling factor of existence.

Thus the penalty of the fall affected the entire man body and soul. Rather than being something physical which flowed through the body, evil or lust was thought of more in terms of perverted knowledge--sensual rather than spiritual knowledge. This is not unusual when one recalls that Rous defined the image and the essential part of man as reason or understanding.[2] Once man turns from the source which enlightens his understanding giving true wisdom, he no longer possesses true knowledge but a false knowledge which inverts the hierarchy of values and sends man seeking the good in that which is not his true end.[3]

Rous like Augustine, Calvin, Luther, and other Christian thinkers never fully solved the problem of the transmission of sin either as original sin or its guilt. It appears that he used the metaphor "juyce" not so much as an actual explanation of how concupiscence entered the human race but rather as a literary way of expressing that which was unexplicable but true for his thought. Evidently he did not actually believe that the "juyce" of the fruit conveyed concupiscence, which he defined as false or erroneous knowledge, or he would have worked out a different scheme of salvation from that which he produced. It can be said at this time that he did refer to a stain or a taint resulting from sin, but the full implications of this point will be evident only when seen in light of his conception of salvation.

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 20, 23. [2] _Ibid_., p. 175

[3] Rous, _Mysticall Marriage_, p. 21.

What ability is left to fallen nature, or is it of no use whatsoever to construct a civil polity or to recognize a natural right and wrong in the universe? Here also Rous is a good Puritan. Though the image is as a shattered mirror that no longer reflects God's image and light, there are, nevertheless, some pieces and parcels of it which remain operative in human nature. True, they look away from the Creator to the creatures, but they still provide some light in the understanding, some freedom in the will, and "some approving good, and accusing of evil in the Conscience."[1] That is sufficient to continue and to preserve mankind in supplying a basis for common society through a relative justice exhibited in human laws.[2] Furthermore, this remaining light enables man to see in creation the impressions and characters of the Creator and to note that the Creator is a Spirit to be worshiped through spiritual worship.[3] However, Rous never ceases to distinguish between a state of nature and a state of grace in which the former never proves sufficient as the true happiness of man or produces works springing from love for God.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 658-659.

[2] Ibid., pp. 659, 507-508.

[3] Ibid., pp. 12, 493, 659. Cf., Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 214-215, 279-280.

## II

Francis Rous's conception of God as essence, God as creator of man, and man as a creature of God was shown to be largely Puritan though somewhat influenced by a Lichtmetaphysik. Next, attention is turned to God the redeemer working man's salvation. Two things are outstanding in Francis Rous's conception of salvation--predestinating, effectual grace, and the operation of the Holy Spirit. Rous accepted the basic tenets of Calvin's soteriology, but it is to be noted that he deviated from it in several important respects. Calvinism was accepted to the extent that he conceived of salvation as entirely from God and a gift to man. This was expressed in the doctrines of effectual grace, double predestination, and perseverance of the saints. Jesus Christ as the mediator and atoner for the sins of man was conceived of as true God-man. The Holy Ghost as the effector and sanctifier of salvation was absolutely necessary in the divine economy.

All this is familiar Calvinism. But the important thing about Rous and many Puritan thinkers of his day was the emphasis placed upon the Holy Spirit.[2] Calvin has been referred to as the theologian of the Holy Spirit because of the vast importance within his system given to the third person of the Trinity in effecting man's salvation and in sanctifying the life of the believer. One of the things to be noted about Rous is the comparatively small amount of space given to the Father as creator and the Son as redeemer. To be sure he always takes for granted the divine plan for salvation and the necessity of the atonement, but almost all of his emphasis is on the activity of the Spirit operating in regeneration, mystical union and sanctification.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 493.

[2] Nuttall, op. cit., passim.

The operation of the Holy Spirit becomes the basis of his mysticism and of his intensely active life in love and service. It will become evident as this thesis proceeds that the Holy Spirit so dominates the theology of Rous that he often reinterprets or goes beyond certain Calvinistic emphases. Again, it will be evidenced that his conception of grace is closer to that of Augustine than it is to Calvin.

This is due primarily to the fact that he conceives of God not only as supreme will but also as light and love. As a consequence, Rous can speak with ease about the necessity of predestinating grace, of man's entire salvation as a gift bestowed by God for God's glory, and yet at the same time plead for the necessity of the spiritual soul of man to free itself from base corrupt matter that the spirit as light might be freed from the darkness of grossness so the grace of God could do its work in the human heart. The result is a confused order of salvation. At times Rous speaks as if repentance precedes faith and at times as if it is dependent upon predestinating grace and faith. This could easily happen to Rous, as it did to many Puritans, because he never set forth his theology in a consecutive or systematic presentation.[1]

---

[1] The closest Rous came to producing a systematic exposition of the Christian faith was in the treatise The Art of Happiness, but it could hardly measure up to the first requirements of a comprehensive theological outline. He did at one time publish three of his treatises together in a single work, Interioria regni Dei, which might have been intended as a presentation of the threefold mystic path. This will be discussed more fully in a later chapter.

Before proceeding to his order of salvation one more thing should be noted. The operation of the Spirit is looked upon first as the means by which man lays hold of salvation, and secondly as the means of retaining the presence of Christ and his benefits through the increase of the Spirit itself in contemplation and works of love. This is the specific point at which Rous goes beyond Calvinism and spiritualists. More will be said about this in a later chapter on the mystical marriage. At present it will serve as an introductory remark to his treatment of salvation and the significance of the Holy Spirit.

Man's salvation is entirely from God the trinity. This is good Augustinian-Calvinism. The entire Trinity is at work in all steps of salvation. Out of his great love God has elected men and appointed or given means to accomplish the end. That is primarily the work of the Father. God the Son has exhibited the means appointed and through his life, death, and resurrection has justified sinners; thus man is saved through Christ. But here too the whole Trinity was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. God the Holy Ghost distributes and imparts the salvation by particular gifts and application. He effects salvation and regenerates fallen man and continues his activity in sanctification. Thus when election, justification, and regeneration are wrought by the Trinity man's salvation is "absolute and full in parts."[1]

Just as the true end of man is the glory of God so the purpose and end of God's redeeming activity, though done out of love and mercy, is his own glory.[2] He alone is the fit end of all his activities, and the Christian recognizes this to be true. God is seen to be the source, effector, and end of virtue, and all truth is from him.[1] The entire plan of salvation is but a "plot of glory" beginning in God and ending in him. Thus not to acknowledge that all is from God is to commit the highest kind of sacrilege and to rob him of his glory.[2] In dealing with contemporary problems of England, Rous showed himself a good Puritan by upholding England as God's chosen Israel and condemning her for taking undue pride in her accomplishments while failing to acknowledge God's grace. As a result, England had to suffer, and the only remedy was a confession of the national sins and repentance from the national evil ways. God's glory would be served in blessing or in judgment.[3]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 509 ff.

[2] Ibid., pp. 107, 110, 304, 510, 651.

Through his "plot of glory" God counteracts the work of the devil and does it in such a way that he repairs fallen man through a remedy that is sufficient for the disease but harmless to the patient.[4] The remedy purges evil and removes guilt but leaves man as man. That is, though the remedy is not a product of man's ingenuity or reason, it is not contrary to his reason for it contains "only those things high above common reason, such as well benefit a Deity, higher by far then his own creatures."[5] God foiled the devil and used the curse to bestow ultimate happiness upon man, and when man looks at the method of the bestowal he notes not injustice but that which is agreeable to "a true Justice, a deep Wisdom, and infinite Power, a free Mercy, and an exact Holiness."[1]

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 179-182.

[2] Rous, Treatises, pp. 501, 651.

[3] Ibid., pp. 225, 228, 229, 295, 303.

[4] Ibid., p. 225.

[5] Ibid., pp. 12 ff. Note here the scholastic definition of revealed truth as not being contrary to reason but above reason.

The cure that God offers man must be equal to the disease. The disease was described in the last chapter while the source of the cure was shown above. But merely saying the cure is from God and sufficient for man is not enough. Our task is to show exactly how the remedy is adequate for man's needs. If man's whole existence, body and soul, is enslaved by concupiscence, man requires a mighty, active, and effectual grace that will stem the tide of lust and activate the will.[2]

The remedy offered is adequate in the fullest sense--it realistically meets man's need and gives full evidence to man showing his dependence upon God. If the former were not given, man would not be sure of his salvation. If the latter were not given God would never receive his glory through man's salvation. To help man's need God gave man a new root more stable than Adam and a better covenant with far better promises attached thereto. To cure man's pride and deceit and to ensure God's glory, he disperses his grace in such a way that man's utter dependence and desperate need are plainly evidenced before his great need is satisfied.[3]

The "plot of glory" as it appeared in history proved beyond a doubt that man could not stand by his free-will. All of history, until the coming of Christ, had a twofold significance. It exhibited on the one hand a long series of failures on the part of man attempting to live by free-will and general grace. On the other hand, ever since the promise of God to the woman in the garden of Eden, God has preserved through his effectual grace a line from the so-called seed of the woman. This was a seed of promise pointing to that which was to transpire when the seed of woman would break the head of the serpent, and a new covenant would be set up. Thus while men were attempting and failing to live by their corrupted understandings and enslaved wills, God preserved a few chosen men to prove that they alone, depending upon effectual grace, were able to stand upright while the world was falling around them.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 26 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 654.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 655.

God not only proved the inability of free-will through a thorough testing in history, he also provided a cure for man as a sinner that was at once fully sufficient for man's predicament and yet dispensed in such a way that it also left no room for pride or self-deceit. Through his merciful intervention God fulfilled the promise to the woman and established the new covenant. The gravest problem was the removal of guilt and corruption which stood between God and man, and the establishment of the seed of the woman with God's law written in their hearts by the Spirit.[2] This will be fully treated when we speak of the mediator and effector of the new covenant--Jesus Christ.

After the removal of guilt and the corruption of sin, the great barrier of God's will being done is the will of man. Unless the love of God is working in the will of man, all works brought forth are dead because they originated in a dead root.[3] This is, of course, the articulation of Augustine's idea that "no fruit is good which does not grow from the root of love."[4] For Augustine this is made possible by the Holy Ghost who sheds abroad the love of God in the human heart.[5] In that way the will which was enslaved by concupiscence is set free to do the law in love and delight.[1] Thus the will is established in true freedom. Calvin, following Augustine, dealt in much the same way with the problem of the freedom of the will and necessity of grace.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 662, 667 ff.

[2] Ibid., p. 657.

[3] Ibid., p. 658.

[4] Augustine, "The Spirit and the Letter," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, ed. P. Schaff (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1887), V, 94.

[5] Ibid., pp. 84 f.

Rous too felt that one of the important aspects of effectual grace was that it gave true freedom to the will and established man in holy living. This was the manner in which God's remedy was sufficient for man's disease.[3] None but God could pierce the heart of man to bind his will and affections "even against his will and affections," with such power that nothing could break the divine hold.[4] That is not to say that God then enslaves the will in place of lust which formerly reigned supreme. Just as the power from on high works in "second causes according to their natures," so "it works in the will of man, by making it most freely willing."[5]

Thus Rous articulates a conception of free will similar to that of Augustine and Calvin. Grace works in the will in such a way that the will also determines the way to which grace inclines it. That is true freedom of will because the will, loving God joyfully, determines to fulfill that end for which it was created. Rous says: ". . . . .For we hold that the will moved effectually by grace, is more then free-will; for it is free will fortified, actuated, and animated by grace."[6] This leaves man more fully man than he was before and brings great glory to God who has turned adverse wills to make them willingly and gladly will what he wills.[7]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 106 f., 110.

[2] Calvin, op. cit., II, ii, 5-8.

[3] Rous, Treatises, p. 654.

[4] Ibid., p. 12.

[5] Ibid., p. 452.

[6] Ibid., p. 484.

[7] Ibid., p. 453.

But the other important aspect of this cure is that it is certain and sure. The man living in effectual grace, the man being of the spiritual seed of the woman, a member of the new covenant, is established in certainty.[1] The "root of righteousness" contained in a "powerful and stable seed" is poured into the heart by the Spirit who writes the law in the heart and leads one to true righteousness and holiness.[2] Therefore, the true safety of man is not in a vain dependence on his free-will, which is really bound, but in his will being held by God and established by grace.[3]

God brought his "plot of glory" to fulfillment by consummating his promise to the woman and her heirs by sending his own Son who raised up a spiritual seed and established them in the new covenant. This new spiritual seed is the Church established in the head and mediator Christ Jesus and confirmed in holiness that triumphs over the seed of the serpent.[4] Thus man's deepest needs were met and an active powerful remedy was applied to his disease--sin.

Before proceeding to the place and work of Jesus Christ in the divine plan of salvation it is necessary to speak of one more important doctrine in Rous's soteriology. Effectual grace to mean anything must be connected with predestination. Starting with the conception of the servitude of the will and the corruption of the understanding, one finds it impossible for the sinner to turn and prepare for salvation. The power of grace is required to be effective and specific in the case of each man repenting and truly turning to God. The fact that some men do receive this grace and firmly stand within the new covenant while other men do not receive effectual grace can be due only to the mercy and wisdom of God.[5]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 661. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 663.

[3] Rous, *Testis Veritatis*, p. 99.

[4] Rous, *Treatises*, p. 677. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

Rous believed in double predestination. God in his mercy chose to save some from their misery and in his justice left others to their self-purchased damnation.[1] This is not as arbitrary as it seems, says Rous. First, the justice of God is always turned against sin to punish it. Sin is contracted by man in free-will; thus, though men are necessarily sinful they became that way through voluntary sinning. It is no excuse to say that it was only Adam's fault because any man would have done the same thing --the print is no better than the stamp.[2] Man's state of corruption is not God's fault, and the Lord is free to use his justice and mercy as will be most advantageous to his glory.

The reason for God choosing some and leaving others is ultimately unknown; it rests in the hidden will of God. But this hidden will has joined to it wisdom and justice. It is not a rash will without knowledge, but whom he knew before, those he predestined.[3] In a way this is a toning down of the arbitrariness of God's will. While Rous never says any more than what is stated above, he often implies that the elect might be much more numerous than one suspects and that any operations of grace, no matter how small, should be looked upon as possibilities of effectual grace; therefore, man should cultivate them and should live as if he were one of the chosen seed or within the new covenant.[4] This is not to say that Rous reached the point of view of some covenant theologians who said that if one commits himself to the covenant and does his part faithfully, he can rest assured that God does his part and one is probably of the elect.[1] But Rous's thought is definitely in that direction.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 138 ff. Cf. Rous, Testis Veritatis, pp. 12, 13, 15.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 139.

[3] Ibid., p. 137.

[4] Ibid., p. 137.

Ultimately, however, for Rous as for all Puritan theologians, the whys and wherefores of election rest in the wisdom of God. That he has revealed his will in scripture and covenant is not to be doubted and is to be held firmly, but basically the root of predestination is unsearchable; so, one must in this case receive truth from God and not invent it from human wit. No man knows the mind of the Lord but him to whom God reveals his mind by his Spirit. He has shown his truth about this problem in Scripture, and those moved by the Spirit of the Lord learn the secret of this doctrine though they see it but through a glass, darkly.[2]

In order to clinch the argument for effectual grace and election Rous attempts to prove that this is the doctrine held by the English church, the greatest fathers of the church , and by the head of the English church, King James. He interprets article seventeen of the Thirty-Nine Articles as proof of the English church's upholding predestination, and article ten as proof of effectual grace over against free-will. Then he proceeds to further proof by quoting from the Anglican collects, prayers, and litany contained in the liturgy. Among the fathers he quotes are Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Anselm, Bernard, Peter Lombard, Thomas

---

[1] P. Miller, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Transactions 1933-1937 (Boston: Published by the Society, 1937), XXXII, 271 ff. Covenant theology was an attempt by Puritan divines to soften the implications of the arbitrary predestinating will of God by substituting a juridicial relationship for a divine decree. God bound himself by a succession of contracts, the old and the new covenants, through which the will of God was clearly known. Under the new covenant all man need do was avail himself of the covenant and God would provide the grace for fulfilling it.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 137.

Aquinas, Bradwardine, and Casander. This imposing array is intended to prove that Arminianism is wrong in rejecting the doctrines of predestination, effectual grace, and perseverance of the saints.[1]

Rous's final word on these doctrines was as follows. These things are essential to any true conception of salvation; they should not be denied or overlooked. But men must beware lest they go above their wisdom at this point. Let each man take that which he can handle. For some men these doctrines edify, but for most they would cause only perplexity. Thus while always preaching and teaching salvation as wholly from God, one should not use these doctrines so they become contentions among simple folk. Let Christians converse on points "of more absolute necessity to salvation and larger edification." These essentials are our ingrafting into Jesus Christ by faith, our growth in him by love, and the stability of our hearts by earnests of testimony through the sanctifying Spirit.[2] Here we see the real interest of Rous emerging--the concern for piety, peace, and love among the members in Christ.[3]

## III

Jesus Christ, true God and true man, as the second person of the Trinity placed himself into the working of man's salvation and became the action exhibition of the means appointed.[4] He came into the world full of grace and truth "even of that grace which creates truth in the inward parts, writes the Law in the Heart, and not in Tables of Stone." This was the appearance of the kingdom of heaven, the time when effectual grace was plentifully shed into the hearts of men.[1] There was nothing greater than God himself, and this greatest Himself was given to man by a "wonderful and mysterious incarnation."[2]

---

[1] Rous, Testis Veritates, passim.

[2] Ibid., p. 140.

[3] This shows that Francis Rous was at one with his age in seeking the essentials of Christianity. He found them not in rational deductions from the totality of Christian doctrine, but he discovered them in that which produced a pious, active, loving, living spirituality.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 510.

The incarnation was the free mercy of God operating that man might be redeemed. But in order that man might be redeemed, the guilt of sin and spot of sin which stood between God and man had to be removed.[3] Man is a slave to wickedness and continually produces evil and offends God; thus guilt and sin possess man. Furthermore, this wickedness is a slave to God's justice which punishes sin. Before man can be redeemed, the guilt of sin which offends God's personal honor must be removed and the bondage of concupiscence must be broken to really set man free.[4]

Just how can Jesus Christ accomplish these two tasks? He is both true God and true man. Born of the Holy Ghost, the streams of sin did not descend upon him and neither did the guilt.[5] As true God, an infinite person, his actions had an infinite value able to satisfy for an infinite number of sinners, for infinite justice, and were able to procure an infinite love.[6] As a true God-man, born without sin, he was able to stand against and overthrow the devil; thus by man the true end of man, obedience, is performed. Also, man becomes the father of man's state of happiness just as he had been the father of man's misery. Thus God reversed the plot of the devil and through man carried out a plot of glory getting the victory through his son.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 668, 604.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 28, 541.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 310.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

In Jesus Christ, God has given a full and perfect means of meeting the twofold disease of man. "God-in-man" is our blessed "Restorer."[2] First, he delivered man from guilt and sin. Rous really had three theories of the atonement though he never explicated any of them in a systematic way. All three were but themes found in Scripture and repeated by Christian thinkers in various ages. He speaks of Christ as the ransom for our sins who frees us from the bondage of misery;[3] he speaks of Christ's blood as that which purges us from guilt,[4] and he speaks of Christ's entire life and death as the satisfaction of God's justice.[5] Christ did die for all, for only in that way could God save whomsoever he pleased.[6]

On the other hand Christ's resurrection was a new life free from the dominion of sin which had taken away his former life, "and this free life, by the spirit of liberty he bestoweth on his members, thereby discharging them from the slavery of sin and consequently of death, the effect of sin."[7] He goes farther than a mere delivery from positive evils and restores to man "a certain ability of performing our duty, and right of beholding our Creator" which is far more stable than man previously had.[8] Rous sums up the result of Christ's work in the following words:

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 27-28. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., pp. 29, 67, 68, 86.

[4] Ibid., p. 375; Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 11.

[5] Rous, Treatises, pp. 269, 30, 541.

[6] Rous, Testis Veritates, p. 86.

[7] Rous, Treatises, p. 29.

[8] Ibid., p. 30. This twofold gift is important for Rous's mysticism in that it enables the believer to do God's will and also as one being pure in heart to have a glimpse of God insofar as it is possible in this life.

> As he freeth us from death, so he giveth us life; as he freeth us from being disobedient to God, so he giveth us an obedience pleasing to God; as he payeth for our defacing of God's Image, so he restoreth again to us the Image itself; and finally, as he taketh from us the wrath and terrors of God, so he gives us the pleasures and happiness which are in the presence of God for evermore.[1]

The work of Jesus Christ is absolutely necessary for redemption, but in addition to his cosmic significance in the spheres of sin, guilt, and justice he is of utmost significance as a teacher and drawing power. While Rous seldom speaks of the imitation of Christ as a pattern for life, he several times mentions him as a teacher who is revealing spiritual doctrines and the significance of the divine plan teaches us to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this life.[2] In his doctrine we see "admirable wisdom, excellent justice, deep mercy, infinite power, and perfect holiness."[3] Furthermore, Jesus Christ has a drawing power on the will of man.[4] He is "all lights in one light, all glories in one glorie, all beauties in one beauty all joyes in one joy."[5] Thus he not only teaches men but draws all men to himself.

But the most important result of the incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus is to be seen in the threefold aspect --the new covenant, the seed of the woman, and the mystical union of the soul with Christ. These three are held in closest connection by Rous and are interdependent as well as mutually interpretative. This is the particular point at which Rous goes beyond the Puritanism of his day. All three concepts were common Puritan property having their most recent source in Calvinism. Calvin had pointed out the necessity of a mystical union between the believer and Christ in order that all Christ's gifts might be bestowed on the believer while all the latter's infirmities might be placed upon Christ.[1] Furthermore the concepts of the seed of the woman and the new covenant were very widely used in contemporary Puritan theology.[2]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 30.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 3; Rous, Treatises, p. 604.

[3] Ibid., p. 558, misnumbered as 574.

[4] Ibid., p. 670.

[5] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 44-45.

But the distinctive contribution of Rous was his use of these concepts not as mere theological doctrines or as certainties of an imminent millennarianism, spiritual or literal, but as a means of producing and explicating a Christ-mysticism expressed in terms of bridal symbolism. He was not a spiritualist such as many left wing Puritans,but he had passed over into mysticism thereby attempting to meet many of the ecclesiological and sociological problems of his day in a new way. He was a Puritan and continued to be concerned with the problems plaguing Puritanism--polity, ethics, the establishment, doctrine, and politics. But he was also a mystic and played his role in life accordingly. This was an age when theology and everyday life were inextricably intermingled, and the historian dares not exclude either. More will be said concerning this when dealing with Rous's political activities and consequences.

Rous's mysticism, then, springs out of conception of salvation. In order for the believer to benefit by Christ's activities, it is necessary that the two become one just as man and wife. This very union can take place because of the activity of the Holy Ghost. Christ is called Christ because he is annointed above all others with the Spirit without measure.[1] This too is good Calvinism and one of the bases of Calvin's great emphasis upon the Spirit as the effector of salvation who brings Christ to man.[2] For Rous this became the means whereby man was ingrafted into Christ or became one with him in a mystical union.[3]

---

[1] Calvin, op. cit., III, i, 1; xi, 10.

[2] Miller, "Marrow of Puritan Divinity," op. cit., passim.

Unless man be of one spirit with Christ Jesus, he is no Christian and has no hope of eternal life any more than man without his spirit can be man and live a temporal life. Just as a soul and body make a man, so Christ's Spirit and a man are a Christian.[4] Only through putting on the spirit of Christ Jesus does the Christian receive power over the domain of Satan.[5] Entering man by his Spirit, Christ imparts to him the satisfaction of his death, frees one from the bondage of sin and death, and at the same time through his Spirit effects his sanctifying work in making one a new man.[6] So one gives the Spirit "leave and power to ransack our hearts, and to kill the sin that offended God." And being conformed to the death of Christ, his sacrifice is given to God in man's behalf.[7]

Man, then, cannot benefit from the incarnation and atonement unless he is one with Christ through the operation of the Holy Spirit. But being knit to Christ in a union he possesses all the gifts of Christ.[8] "By his precious blood he purgeth her from her guilt, and by his spirit he purifieth her from her incleanesse;

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 324-325; 656.

[2] Calvin, op. cit., III, i, 2.

[3] Rous, Treatises, pp. 156, 504.

[4] Ibid., pp. 324, 496.

[5] Ibid., p. 324.

[6] Ibid., p. 156.

[7] Ibid., p. 269.

[8] Ibid., p. 30.

and both of these he bestoweth on her in his marriage with her."[1] This is the source of all blessings bestowed by Christ. It is a union with God who is blessedness and is seen as a spiritual reality by the eye of the soul beholding the seed of God poured into the heart of man.[2] Though this spiritual union is very real it is not a personal or hypostatical union such as that which existed between Christ as God and man. Personal here means a commingling of two substances or spirits in an immediate union in which the two are indistinguishably one. Our union is a mediate union based upon Christ's hypostatical immediate union of God and man.[3] This will again be referred to in the chapter where we will speak of the mystical marriage.

The consummation of this union is expressed by Rous in his typically beautiful prose when he says:

> Christ Jesus the precious Pearle of the Gospel, in whom are al treasures of blessdnesse, Anoynting our eyes with his oyntments, appears to us the fairest of men; and annoynting our hearts with his oyntments, fills our hearts with such love of him that we are drawne to run after him; and running after him, we overtake him, and overtaking wee are married to him: but being married to him Christ well-beloved is ours; and if Christ be ours, all things with him are ours also.[4]

Two other ways of expressing the results of Christ's work on our behalf and the consequent union which occurs are the doctrines of the seed of the woman and the new covenant. These typical Puritan concepts became stepping stones in Rous's development of mysticism and furnished further material for his personal synthesis between the historical and personal conception of faith.

As was previously mentioned the new covenant and the seed of the woman were part of God's plot of glory to restore fallen man and give him a more stable root to oppose the seed of the serpent.[1] In due time God sent his Son who became man, or the seed of the woman, who would break the serpent's head.[2] Thus , the root and head of this seed is knit to deity by a personal union and is filled with the spirit without measure. He is the first born among many brethren.[3] But Christ is not ashamed to call man brethren as he is one seed and one spirit with him.

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 11.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 35.

[3] Ibid., pp. 166, 656, Cf. Rous, Testis Veritates, p. 80.

[4] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 25-26.

The chief seed is Christ the head while the inferior seed is the body composed of those ingrafted by faith. The two together make up one Christ in a mystical union, the Church, the body of Christ, as the promised seed of the woman. This seed is at enmity with the seed of the serpent and final victory will be given to the whole seed of the woman.

It cannot fail because Christ's humanity knit to deity gives a firmer foundation than that of Adam. The seed from God, born of effectual grace has greater stability than a seed from man. This is especially true because those into whom this seed of God enters "it gives a communion with God: and knits them to the Deity: and builds them upon it."[4] Thus it is an immortal and incorruptible seed "being the seed of God an immortal Father; and it is also strongly nourished and maintained in life and Immortality, by the union which it hath with the Deity."[5]

This seed, as is by now apparent, is none other than Christ Jesus entering the heart through his Spirit. God is hereby given his due glory in that he performed his promise. He promised a seed to the woman, even Christ mystical as well as Christ personal, and he fulfilled that promise.[1] Just as the earth is cured by husbandry and good seed, so is man brought into a fruitful nature and cured from the first Adam by the last Adam through the regeneration of "Christ the Chief Husbandman, and the Seed of the Word. . . . ."[2]

---

[1] See above, p. 80.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 656.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

This is a spiritual and invisible generation through the new Adam, but thereby it is a better generation. The carnal root of generation, the visible Adam in every man issuing in death and bondage, is corporeal and gross and will pass away. The spiritual root of generation, the new, invisible Adam engendering life and happiness, is pure and glorious and will endure forever.[3] Man should pray that he be cut off from the first root and ingrafted into the second root.[4]

Though this is not the proper place to speak of the new covenant because it is not evident in man until regeneration and repentance have written the law in man's heart, it should be mentioned in connection with the work of Christ because he introduced it into history along with the mystical union and seed of the woman. The three belong together in Rous's thought even if they would be logically separated in a systematic ordo salutis.

Where there is a likeness and conformity to God, there is also a covenant with God. There the law is written unto the heart as evidence of the new covenant.[5] Through our union with Christ we have what he had in his birth. He was without sin and guilt, and in our new-birth when we put him on, God cuts us off from sin and writes his laws in our hearts that we might fulfill them in love.[1] That is the great promise of God, that he will put his law in the hearts of his children, and that he will remember their sins no more. Both the new creature and the remembering sins no more are ours through union with Christ whereby we are washed by the Holy Ghost.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 453. [2] Ibid., p. 511.

[3] Ibid., pp. 504, 505.

[4] Ibid., p. 504. Here is to be noted Rous's characteristic emphasis on the spiritual as the real and enduring over against the material as the gross, corporeal, and vanishing. It is another indication of Platonism and is in keeping with a Lichtmetaphysik.

[5] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 116-117. He is here dependent upon Augustine, John 6, Tract., 26, which he cites in a footnote. He also cites Jer. 31: 33.

Thus man as a member of the new covenant, belonging to the seed of the woman and being knit to Christ in faith, is part of a great cosmic battle for "there is a two fold Kingdom set up in this world: a Kingdom of darkness, of sin and of misery: and a Kingdom of light, of holiness, and of happiness: the King of the one, is the chief of evil spirits: and the King of the other is the chief of men, even the Chief Son of Man."[3]

Before proceeding to treat more specifically the operation of the Holy Spirit in effecting and bringing home salvation to the believer, it would be well to say a few words concerning the activity of man in procuring the Spirit. Francis Rous, as all Puritans and predestinarians, had difficulty in explaining why he encouraged so much moral activity and pious intent on the part of all men if man's activity ultimately had nothing to do with his salvation.

Rous posed that question for himself and then countered with a twofold answer. On the one hand, while true grace does come from above, it communicates itself to us through means left with us on earth.[4] On the other hand, grace works by degrees and so it is very easy to overlook the first faint beginnings; however, if one quickly perceives them and seizes upon them they turn into testimonials of grace.[1] Furthermore, though man, apart from divine aid, cannot prefer or use the means left for grace, natural man can note the following encouraging things about Christianity. Searching the history of Christian writers one notes that their works do testify in such a worthy manner that flesh and blood could not be responsible. Also, natural man looking at the end proposed by Christianity notes it is eternal felicity while it requires of man only piety and purity.[2] All this tends to impel him towards the Christian religion.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 310.

[2] Ibid., p. 592. [3] Ibid., p. 26. [4] Ibid., p. 45.

These reservations made by Rous were but ways to soften the arbitrariness of God's divine decree of election, and in practice they turn out to be means of exhortation which operate as if man were free to win God's grace. This was typical of English Puritanism. Looked at more closely, in operation, the first readjustment is made on the basis of God's revealed will. God has told us through Christ that he will be "overcome by importunity," so "let us seek importunately still begging, following and undenyably soliciting him until he give the Holy Ghost to them that ask him."[3] Man should make haste to get a clean heart and right spirit within him. Through "earnest Prayer to the Father of Spirits," man should entreat to be made spiritual that he might please God and so God as a spirit might then really please man. For in this conformity of like drawing like is true harmony, pleasure, and delight.[4] All this activity on the part of man is nothing more than making use of those means which God has chosen to bring man to grace.

---

[1] _Ibid_.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 46.

[3] _Ibid_., pp. 552-553; 508.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 114.

Secondly, if grace does work by degrees man must be extremely careful not to overlook or take lightly any operations of grace because man thereby will inadvertently oppose and hinder the work of the Spirit.[1] So the novice or apprentice of religion should be especially diligent in entreating the Spirit to open closed eyes, to lighten the darkness of man, and to establish him firmly in "the beginnings of this new Art and Science of Joy."[2] Thus man will not ignore the mercy of God thereby making more work for him and endangering oneself through judgment.[3] Man must realize that it is the ladder of free mercy that sends these blessings down to man, and once that ladder is withdrawn to heaven a great gulf separates God and man, and man is no longer able to entreat and behold God in his mercy but is cut off by God's anger.[4]

Rous sums up the whole thing where he says that if man has any beginnings of grace he should cherish them or if he has none he should plead for them. In his own words:

> If there be in us a godly and immortal seed, let us water it, let us cherish it, as the life of our life: if it be not in us, let us violently knock at the door of heaven with panting desires, with vehement supplications, until there be an opening to our knocking, a giving to our asking; and until they that thirst may drink freely of the waters of life.[5]

---

[1] That grace works in degrees does not mean that it is put into man by a series of injections, but rather that it operates as a power only to the extent that man is ready to receive it without doing violence to man as man.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 119.

[3] Ibid., p. 526.

[4] Ibid., p. 60. This is one of the two places where Rous uses the ladder symbolism, but he means by it the way of God down to man rather than the ladder by which man climbs to God. However, the purpose of the descending ladder of mercy is to enable man to ascend to his source and Creator. That is good Augustinianism. Nygren, op. cit., Part II, pp. 310 ff.

[5] Rous, Treatises, p. 93.

In a different way and in more legalistic terms the covenant theologians were preaching the same thing. To perplex oneself about the secret operation of God's will was impious and foolish, but God in the covenant made an offer, invitation, and command to man so man should answer it.[1] Sibbes in particular takes the next step and says if man is not yet in the covenant he should through prayer, fasting, and commitment of self to the covenant importune God under the conditions of the new covenant to bestow that which is promised--grace.[2]

Finally, in a tone that does not sound compatible with a conception of effectual grace, but in a tone prevalent in most Puritan preaching and exhortation, Rous says men should strive to present themselves as empty vessels altogether void that they might be fully capable of the grace they pray for and that it might fill them fully.[3] Before that is possible the "swelling of lust" must be slain for the seed of grace will never take root in pride.[4]

A spirit flesh dichotomy is apparent here, but it does not seem to be purely in Calvinistic-Augustinian terms. It often sounds very much like Lichtmetaphysik based upon Neoplatonic metaphysics. The soul that prepares for God should "untie herself" from herself as something corrupted and from the world as both are blinded and walking into darkness.[5]

Again, he speaks of the soul as sitting in the darkness of a dungeon striving to get a ray of light that will guide it through the darkness to the glorious city where God is the sun.[6] This harks back to Plato's famous figure of the man chained in caves unable to see but shadows of things. It has even more apparent origins in Calvin's use of the same figure to describe the need imprisoned soul.[1]

---

[1] Miller, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," op. cit., pp. 271 f.

[2] Ibid., p. 273. [3] Rous, Treatises, p. 494.

[4] Ibid., p. 596. [5] Ibid., p. 520. [6] Ibid., p. 492.

The result of such a view is that man bends every effort to ascertain both the full extent of his corruption and punishment and the slightest extent of the operation of the Spirit. Laying hold of whatever grace is available, fully conscious of his misery, man is led to hunger and thirst after salvation. Then does God open his eyes as "Christ Jesus with the beams of his saving health, will shine in upon our understandings, and shew them his beauty, and upon our wills through our understandings to comfort, nourish, and draw them, and this will he do, just at that time when we feelingly complain and in the shadow of death."[2]

---

[1] Calvin, op. cit., III, ii, 19.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 49. Logically this would be the proper place to summarize the means of grace, Scripture, and the doctrine of the Church; however, some of that will be treated in the next chapter on the operation of the Holy Spirit, and the remainder will be analyzed under the section of the rule of the Spirit in the life of believers. In that way the relation of Rous's mysticism, ethic, and Puritan doctrines will be more clearly delineated.

# CHAPTER III

## THE HOLY SPIRIT AND SALVATION

This chapter concludes the discussion of Rous's conception of salvation. It is a separate chapter because of the vast importance given to the Holy Spirit in his thought and because it exhibits his relation to, yet difference from, contemporary Puritan thinking on the Spirit. Also, it will be evident, as was indicated in the last chapter, that this doctrine is paramount in his mysticism. The attempt will be made to point out the activity of the Holy Spirit from two different aspects, the God-ward and the man-ward. The former will explicate what God does through the Holy Spirit to effect and bring home the salvation wrought in Christ Jesus. The latter will show how the Holy Spirit operates in man as he appropriates the salvation offered by God.

In the last chapter the activity of God the Father and Son operating in behalf of man's salvation was one of our interests. The main emphasis fell upon the historical activity of God in the past as he set in motion his plot of glory and proved the necessity of predestinating effectual grace. With the coming of Jesus Christ, God fulfilled his promise to the seed of the woman. Through the life, death, obedience, and resurrection of Jesus Christ a propitiation and satisfaction for the guilt of all sins was offered to God's justice by God himself in man. All this was God's activity in the past and necessarily was described in terms of theological doctrines.

On the other hand, the result of Christ's activities was extremely personal and ever contemporary. Man's soul was to become the bride of Christ in a spiritual marriage of the deepest and most personal union. Or again, Christ became the head of the seed of the woman while those belonging to him made up the body grafted to him and so comprised his mystical body. From a third point of view those living in Christ were members of the new covenant having the laws of God written on their hearts while their sins were remembered no longer. All these personal results of Jesus's activity were presented in a descriptive way though it was stated that all three depended upon the activity of the Spirit.

This chapter, then, is a continuation of Rous's conception of salvation. The Holy Spirit is at once the effector and sanctifier providing a close link between God's historical activity in behalf of man and the personal life of piety which results because of the action. By far the greatest amount of space is given to the personal results of Christ's activity as effected in man by the Holy Spirit as over against God's activity in behalf of man. Rous did not intend to take the prophets and cross lightly, he accepted them as absolutely necessary, and after showing their basic importance he proceeded to devote most of his attention to man's personal appropriation of happiness. The Holy Spirit, consequently, came in for a great deal more emphasis than God the creator or the historical Jesus.

But Rous was no exception to his Puritan contemporaries in this respect. The one doctrine that received a fresh interpretation and application in Puritanism was that of the Holy Spirit. It was treated not so much from the aspect of its relation to Trinitarian theology, as had previously been done, but more from its practical side in relation to faith and piety.[1] There were many reasons why this doctrine became so important in Puritan theology. Geoffrey Nuttall in his recent study aptly summarized the predilection of Puritan theology for the Holy Spirit and indicated many reasons why this was so.[1]

---

[1] St. Basil, "De Spiritu Sancto," Nicene and Post-Nicene

The spirit of the seventeenth century was in the direction of experimentation and personal feeling or assurance in all phases of life.[2] In science, literature, philosophy, and religion this drive towards personal experience or truth as it applied to the individual was apparent. The tremendous unrest and surging excitement of the century found its center on the English scene during the forties and fifties; consequently the appeals to the liberty and authority of the Spirit began in earnest at that time and flourished until a few years after the restoration. Nuttall might have shown a little more clearly that this doctrine was always central in Puritan theology for Puritanism was always a religion emphasizing personal experience.

His characterization of the problems connected with the Puritan thought on the Spirit is most valuable. It indicates most clearly that this doctrine was the focal point of the struggle between historical dogma or objective doctrine and personal faith. Also, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was a possible means whereby one or the other was transcended or omitted, or the means whereby a balance was struck between the two. Problems such as the Spirit

---

Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1895), VIII, 1-50; St. Augustine, "De Trinitate," Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series, ed. Philip Schaff (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1887), III, 18-228. John Owen, Two Discourses Concerning the Holy Spirit and His Work the One of the Spirit as A Comforter, the Other, as He is the Author of Spiritual Gifts (Glasgow: Edward Khull and Co., 1816).

[1] Nuttall, op. cit., pp. 6-8.

[2] Basil Willey, The Seventeenth Century Background (London: Chatto and Windus, 1934), pp. 26, 120, 122, 133.

and the word, discerning of the Spirit, the witness of the Spirit, and the fellowship of the Spirit highlight the struggle that was engaging serious religious minds.

The major mystical and exhortative treatises of Rous were written before the commonwealth era, but he too reflects the Puritan use of the Holy Spirit as a means for settling the problem between historical and personal faith. His interest, like that of Richard Sibbes, was devotional and not controversial, so while he worked out his conception of the Spirit apart from controversy with opposing Puritan views he had, nevertheless, to come to grips with some of the problems that agitated later treatments of the doctrine.

The most important thing to note is that he used the doctrine not as the means for establishing the validity of the rapidly approaching millenium, or as the proof for the indwelling Spirit giving infallibility in doctrine and ethical conduct, or as the means whereby one could suspend or ignore external forms of worship and sacraments, or as an integral part of a theological system to be explicated in relation to a total systematic conception of divine truth.[1] Rather, he found the doctrine of the Spirit the means to explicate how God brings home to man personally the salvation wrought by Christ Jesus, and also the means whereby man himself reaches out and apprehends this salvation, grows in it and retains it. Thus the Holy Spirit becomes the effector of the mystical union between Christ and the believer and the sanctifier of the new man.

Rous was greatly disturbed by the disproportion between knowledge and action in his age. There was a "meere resting in knowledge short of action."[1] Any knowledge of God to be true knowledge must be effectual and working knowledge.[2] It is not enough that man knows how he is restored to happiness, but man must actually lay hold of this happiness, retain it, and increase it.[3] The trouble is that man wants either one or the other. It is of no use to know there is a happiness or even have "an hand stretched out to deliver this happiness to us, if we have not also a hand to receive it."[4]

---

[1] The Fifth Monarchy Men serve as examples of the first usage while George Fox, Sir Harry Vane, Junior, and John Owen are, respectively, examples of the remaining viewpoints.

It is not enough that God has once entered history and through his Son conquered sin and death. His word must still be an active, operative, forcible, and effectual word "that speaks what it does, and does what it speaks." If he says let there be light then the light of our souls can see the "great Object of our Souls, the perfect Light Jesus Christ."[5] So even for giving and applying our salvation there is an instrument given by God.[6] The means he uses to bestow and impart his benefits is his Spirit, and the action he uses is regeneration.[7] While he calls on us with his outward word he calls, moves, and teaches us with his "operative word" that our souls are filled with good things, even himself who is goodness itself.[8]

The Holy Spirit is the means whereby God imparts his benefits. Rous is but little concerned with the theological relations of the persons of the Trinity. Apart from his one reference to work of the entire Trinity in all phases of man's redemption, he seldom refers to the three persons and one substance.[1] Again, he is consciously practical at the expense of theological distinctions. The result is that Rous, like so many Puritans, never seemed to work out a clear conception of the relation between the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 491. [2] Ibid., p. 43.

[3] Ibid., p. 39. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid., p. 135.

[6] Ibid., pp. 30, 440.

[7] Ibid., pp. 30, 516.

[8] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 28.

As was previously indicated, Christ is so called because he is anointed above all others by the Spirit without measure.[2] This is reminiscent of Sibbes and other good Puritans and is to be traced back to Calvin and Augustine and to the Scriptures themselves.[3] The real problem that emerges is the relation between the Holy Spirit and the Spirit of Christ Jesus. In traditional Christian theology they are not the same. Certainly Rous intended to keep them distinct, but the manner in which he speaks of them and uses them interchangeably leads to a confusion between the Holy Spirit as person and the Spirit of Christ Jesus.[4]

The Spirit is spoken of as the "breath and vertue of the the Highest," but he also seems to be equated at times with the spirit of Christ.[5] It is only in relation to Rous's bridal mysticism that the whole problem becomes clear. Here it is quite evident that the Holy Spirit which illumines and regenerates man brings about a mystical union in faith and becomes the means whereby Christ or Christ's Spirit enters the soul of man.[6] Nevertheless, in other parts of Rous's writings there is a certain amount of confusion with regard to the two.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 509. [2] Ibid., pp. 324-325, 593, 656.

[3] Richard Sibbes, Works, V, 413, quoted in Nuttall, op. cit, 145. Cf., Calvin, op. cit., III i, 2.

[4] Rous, Treatises, pp. 593, 324, 496, 269, ~~156~~.

[5] Ibid., pp. 30, 38.

[6] Rous, Heavenly Academie, passim. Rous, Mysticall Marriage, passim.

This much is clear, that all benefits of Christ's work are available to man only through the operation of the Spirit. God alone has the key which unlocks the heart of man, and that key is the Spirit working in regeneration.[1] But before the Spirit enters in regeneration, it must work repentance in the heart of man. Rous follows no set order in relating the various steps of salvation. He does not say which comes first, faith or repentance, as Calvin does, but he merely states that the following are results of the Spirit's operations--faith, justification, repentance, regeneration, union, and sanctification.[2] One thing is evident, all of the above are effected through the Spirit.

Three things are apparent in Rous's conception of the place and importance of repentance in the Christian life. First is the idea that repentance can come only through the operation of the Spirit, for as Rous said:

> . . . . .in the grace of Repentence the Spirit entreth, bringing also with him the grace of Christs Justification. In summ, by the admitting of Christs Spirit renewing, we receive Christ; acquitting and renewing is as the point of the needle of the Spirit, by which the Spirit pierceth itself into our hearts, bringing the pardon of sins repented into our souls, and the same sent from God for his Christs sake, but imparted, sealed, and ratefied by the Spirit.[3]

Secondly, repentance cannot be thought of apart from a mortification of the flesh or the old Adam. Because of his sins against God, man experiences punishment. Begging an eye salve from the Spirit, man is illumined and brought to see the horror of sin from the standpoint of the Lord.[4] Thus man condemns himself in detestation, sincerely confesses his sins, and seeks to revenge himself on his old self as sinner.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 135.

[2] Calvin, op. cit., III, iii, 1, 2. Cf., Rous, Treatises, pp. 258-299.

[3] Ibid., p. 72. [4] Ibid., pp. 258-260, 265, 519.

The mortification of the flesh and hatred of sin in oneself are absolutely necessary before one can experience the justifying death of Christ. As was indicated in the last chapter, man stands under guilt and the stain of sin. Rous is emphatic in stating that as long as the spot of sin lies on man's heart the guilt of sin is not ordinarily forgiven.[1] One has to be bathed in repentance by which Christ's Spirit washes away the spot of sin before Christ's blood can be applicable to one's guilt.[2]

This conception rests upon Rous's doctrine of God as comprising both mercy and judgment.[3] Furthermore, he found abundant evidence for it in the Catholic fathers.[4] If God is both mercy and righteousness or judgment, his honor would be endangered if he would accept Christ's satisfaction for impenitent sinners; but when man through the grace of repentance is brought to hate his sins then both God's righteousness and mercy agree to forgive him.[5] To illustrate this doctrine Rous uses a common misinterpretation of the parable of the prodigal son in which the elder brother offers satisfaction for the younger while the younger lies on the ground truly repentant and humbling himself. The father really could not accept the son unless both actions had occurred.[6] Forgiveness, then, actually does not take place until this two-fold action has transpired.[7]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 269, 512, 515, 518.

[2] Ibid., p. 512. [3] Ibid., p. 270.

[4] Ibid. To substantiate his view of repentance, Rous cited Basil, Regal. contra., 10, 12; Jerome, adver. Pelg, lib. 2; and Gregory, Ezek. hom., 7.

[5] Rous, Treatises, p. 270. [6] Ibid.

[7] Nygren, op. cit., I, Part I, 58 ff. Forgiveness of sins

Such a view raises the problem of Rous's conception of justification. He speaks very little of justification by faith, but again it is something he feels is axiomatic.[1] Man's work or activities have nothing to do with his salvation, but faith is so closely bound up with his delineation of regeneration and repentance that it loses its clarity and vitality in comparison with a Puritan like Owen. Somewhat later, a picture of justifying faith will be given from within the content of regeneration. The important thing to note is that justification and sanctification are wrought together by the Spirit. God has ordered that the taking away of "filth" should go with the taking away of the guilt.[2]

The mortification of the flesh also comprises the activities of a believer in taking sides with God against himself as sinner and the pursuing of punishments on oneself. This is done both by an outward and an inward activity. The anger and revenge consists of completely voluntary fasting and penitent labors as well as inward humbling of the heart. None of this has any value for man's salvation or the appropriation of forgiveness; it is only a true expression of repentance and the consequent determination to keep the body serviceable to the soul and to humble oneself.[3] This too is good Puritanism which harks back to Calvin's conception of repentance as being both a mortification embracing proper fasting, or a humble heart and vivification, andregeneration through the Holy Spirit.[4]

---

while man is yet a sinner does not seem to be prominent in Rous's thought, but only forgiveness after man has repented and allowed the Spirit to remove the spot of sin that Christ's blood might then justify. All still depends upon election,for those whom God would save he gives his Spirit that those men might truly repent so forgiveness could really operate.

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 311, 449. [2] Ibid., p. 269.

[3] Ibid., pp. 266-271. [4] Calvin, op. cit., III, iii, 5.

Thirdly, repentance consists in a turning from sin to righteousness which is the main work of the Spirit in repentance.[1] Sin must be put off and cut off at the root while at the same time righteousness must be put on in the new man.[2] This full submission to the Spirit breaking down sin and making a new man is the Spirit's way of revenge on the sin which grieved it.[3] Then our souls, which were put "out of joint" by sin, are put back "in joint" again by the Spirit, and man is restored to harmony.[4] All this is the result of the operation of Spirit in repentance, so let man make this grace of repentance his own by practicing it, for only then can it heal him "when by particular applying it to our own souls, we make it our repentence."[5]

The soul, says Rous, putting off her own corruption and that of the world in repentance is "fit and ready to be new stamped with the image of her Creator, and to be inlightened with truth in her understanding, and to put on rightness in her will, which let her learn from the law and desire to have ingraven in her by grace."[6]

The third aspect of repentance, vivification which results in turning to righteousness, can also be viewed as regeneration. This is but another way of looking at the God-ward side of the operation of the Holy Spirit. That is to say, though regeneration is an act which takes place in the heart of each believer, it is here described from the standpoint of how and why the Spirit so operates in man. Later we will note how man through the activity of the Spirit actually appropriates this regeneration through his will and understanding. That will be the man-ward side of the Spirit's operation.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 271. [2] Ibid., p. 295.

[3] Ibid., p. 515. [4] Ibid., pp. 271, 279.

[5] Ibid., p. 295. Again, note the appeal to the human will to "make" repentance our own as if by so doing we can place ourselves within grace as promised by God.

[6] Rous, Treatises, p. 520.

In light of the past two chapters it will be seen at once that regeneration will operate on man's understanding and will. Until man has the image of God reformed in his soul he cannot know God truly or be known of God.[1] Until then he is but a brute beast "concluded" under the senses and cannot truly discern spiritual doctrines and offer spiritual service to God.[2] Man is nothing but darkness and pollution contrary to God. The Father in heaven must give that to man which will conform him to God before he can return a service conformable to God.[3] The lamp of the understanding has so much moisture cast upon it that man's candle or reason no longer lights the way. The will has so much mud cast upon it that the celestial feathers are unable to mount. This condition of man is compared by Rous to the first chaos as being void and without form and having darkness on the face of it.[4]

Darkness and sensuality are stamped in an almost "indelible Character" on man. The only way man can be lighted anew and made spiritual is by a new begetting by the Father of spirits.[5] Nothing less than an actual crossing of nature is required.[6] In one compact and well formulated sentence Rous describes the condition and regeneration of man. "The sight, the love, the trust of carnal man, are all bowed down, and there is a yoke and bondage of spirit, and a spirit of bondage upon him; but God by the spirit of his Son in regeneration breaks this yoke and sets us upright, so that our eyes, our love and our trust look up to Heaven, and there see glorious sights."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 508. [2] Ibid., p. 196. [3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 173. [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid., p. 508.

The operation of the Spirit in regeneration has to deal with man's sinful root of lust which keeps him bent down in will and darkened in the understanding. Looked at from one aspect, regeneration is both a knife cutting man off from his sinful root and a pouring of the immortal seed into the heart of man by grafting him into the seed of the woman. The Spirit is the knife that cuts man from the old stock of Adam, the stem of corruption.[2] Furthermore the knife of the Spirit rips the flesh from the soul so a celestial light reigns in place of darkness, and the will becomes a spiritual freeman.[3]

Regeneration is also seen to be a spiritual blessing in which the eye of the soul beholds a godly nature poured into the heart of man.[4] This seed of God is the seed of life whereby man passes from death to life as his nature is changed and born anew.[5] Henceforth man is dead to lust and alive to truth, and reason as regeneration issues in a new writing of the Spirit in the hearts of man.[6]

The activity of the Spirit in regeneration may also be viewed as a fourfold activity in the life of each believer. Rous puts it this way: "Lastly, (though it be hard to give a taste of God's blessing in this life) the spirit of Christ, besides the light of direction and clarification, besides the Oyl of gladness, besides that highest and supremest Union, it gives also to the members of Christ a Testimonial and Patent of their salvation and happiness."[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 595. This is the same expression used by Augustine to describe sinful man seeking his good, his _bonum_, in that which is lower than God his true end; thus man is _curvatus_ or bent down. Cf., Nygren, _op_. _cit_., II, Part II, 267 ff.

[2] Rous, _Treatises_, pp. 309-210.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 205. [4] _Ibid_., p. 35. [5] _Ibid_., pp. 510, 515

[6] Rous, _Heavenly Academie_, p. 46.

First, it gives man a rectified soul which labors to behold things in their truth and to place each thing in its proper place so man can determine and recognize his true end.[2] This is necessary because man's true goal is spiritual and can be understood only in such spiritual terms by a spiritual mind.[3] Such a mind is the gift of the Holy Spirit through regeneration and illumination. Until fleshly taste be put off, man will not relish spiritual joys for every appetite pleases itself "most in an object fitting and proportionable to itself, and it is not the excellency of the object, but the agreeableness, that makes it delightful."[4]

So man must put off human wisdom to be captured by the Spirit that a spiritual understanding might grasp a spiritual doctrine.[5] Then this meeting of a spiritual hand with a spiritual truth leads to a uniformity which grows to a unity so they "kiss, embrace, and clasp one another, and the gates of Hell cannot pluck them assunder."[6] Here is evidenced another facet of Rous's mysticism which will be more clearly explicated in the following chapter on the mystical marriage. At present it is sufficient to indicate the importance of the Spirit as the means whereby mystical union is attained, maintained, and developed.

The mystical union itself is the second result of the

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 38. [2] Ibid., pp. 2, 111.

[3] Ibid., pp. 196, 33, 530.

[4] Ibid., p. 33.

[5] Rous, Testis Veritatis, p. 102.

[6] Rous, Treatises, p. 196.

Spirit's operation. It is the means whereby life and power are communicated to the believer just as a tree sends sap into the ingrafted branches which it strives to adopt and knit to itself.[1] Thereby Christ lives in his members, and they live in him and gain all his benefits while they place their burdens upon him.[2] This union is the "knot of blessedness," a grafting into the new Adam whereby we are made one with God. All this can be called regeneration or new making of sinful man into the image of God.[3]

The results of the union and work of the Spirit can be called the restoration of man's ability to behold his creator in mystical experiences and to perform the duty God wills for him.[4] Man's miseries are placed behind and he is set on the path of duty marked out by the Spirit. Both actions are the results of one Spirit renewing and conforming.[5]

Furthermore, man has a taste or "some fruitian of this happiness, and privileges thereof" which serves as a patent, and testimony of his future.[6] Rous says: "For even here have we a crany opened, by which some beams of the divine Glory shine into our hearts, and give us a glimpse of that whereof hereafter we shall have a full enjoying."[7] This is pure mysticism in which the believer is given just a glimpse of that which he will behold in eternity. He goes so far as to say that such men have had heavenly trances. "They that have had such flashes of happiness, have been ravished up in heavenly trances far above the world, and have so much despised the world, as the world hath despised these joys."[8] They have cried out as men who have already taken possession of true rest and felicity and there wanted to build their tabernacles.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 30. [2] Ibid., p. 31. [3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 30. [5] Ibid., p. 31. [6] Ibid., p. 34

[7] Ibid., pp. 34-35. [8] Ibid., p. 35.

The content of such "ravishings" or "patents of future bliss" are described in terms of a Lichtmetaphysik as the high and purest light. Rous says: ". . . . so nothing can be more comfortable to the sight of the soul, then to behold the Sun of the Sun, even that high and purest Light, which shineth upon the Sun and all other things that shine but especially on Spirits, himself being a Spirit."[1]

Or again, the "very substance of the Spirit in us" is a heavenly oil that makes man's heart glad because it gives a true "taste and relish of the deity" and anoints the heart with "light" to guide it, "vertue" to move it to good, and frees from sin.[2] So the heart "feeleth in it self a blessed Rest, or heavenly Sabbath, a joy glorious and unspeakable, a harmony and peace with God, which passeth understanding."[3] From this union and its gifts come "vehement pangs and expressions of love and joy, uttered by the Spouse of Christ, and penned by the Sons of God" which are understood only by spiritual men.[4] From the unheard sound of this harmony between Christ and the soul come those dancings and exultations of the sons of God who for joy of heart have danced before him. Flesh and blood see only the dance and do not hear the music of spiritual harmony.[5] Rous here seems to refer to David and his famous dances before the Lord, but he does not explicitly state so. He was opposed to so-called fanaticism and never seemed sympathetic to the Quakers or Ranters.

Finally, there is a joy of gladness which comes with the operation of the Spirit in repentance and regeneration. The result of the union is felt "chiefly in the will and affections," where a "filial love, joy, and fear" is felt towards God as a father.[1] A strong confidence and joy possesses man as the Spirit dwelling in him turns the evils of life into exercises for the spirit or into educative influences upon man's remaining evil.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

Once the Spirit has given his testimony that one is a son of God because he is Christ's and Christ's is his, then one need no longer fear God but serve him in gladness and confidence.[3] Man can rest content in this "Manna of the Spirit" which feeds and comforts man, for even though it is but a "small dram of our new birth" it is "of the womb of the morning, it comes from the day-spring on high, it hath life eternal in it," and as the light which is the lamp of man it is also the "fire by which in some measure he is partaker of the Divine Nature."[4]

That strong confidence and joy which leaves man content in the assurance that he is God's and enables man to serve God's glory in gladness is indeed the work of the Spirit. Rous indicates this in speaking of regeneration in language that sounds much like that he employed in singing the praises of the various gifts that result from the spiritual marriage and heavenly visitations. He wrote as follows:

> There is a secret earning and owning of God for a Father, put into the soul of a son of God, by the Spirit which new begetteth him, and thereby he calls God Father: and yet not he, but the very seed and spirit of his Father in him. And when this call ascends up unto God, it moveth his bowels of compasion: So that if a mother could forget her child, yet God cannot forget his son. She speaks to God in the very language of Heaven, which flesh and blood understands not; but he knows the meaning of the spirit, who gave the spirit unto man. There is an Abba, Father, which no man knows but he that hath it: and he that hath it cannot express it: it is like the earning of a Lamb, whereby she owneth her Dam; by which she owneth her, but knows not her self whereby she owneth her.[5]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 31.

[3] Ibid., pp. 37-38.

[4] Ibid., pp. 525, 178.

[5] Ibid., p. 302. Cf., p. 597.

The operation of the Spirit can also be seen from a manward side as evidenced in the understanding and will of man. Here too, God is theoretically the basis of all man's reactions in that as Creator, God gave man the two faculties of the soul necessary for response, and as Holy Spirit, God enlightens the understanding and moves the will. But, from the man-ward side the reactions of man seem to be primarily an intense striving and action of the soul. God revealed himself as the sovereign good in Jesus Christ and imparts himself through his Spirit, but man himself must receive the gift of happiness by appropriating it.

To receive and apply this salvation the understanding must know that God is true happiness and blessedness and is the only way to himself. This can be seen only when the understanding acknowledges God in Christ to be what he is--blessedness itself and the mediator of blessedness.[1] This is the proper place to speak of Francis Rous's conception of faith. It is primarily saving knowledge delivered to the understanding by the Spirit and working upon the will and affections to produce commitment.

There is only one saving faith in Christ Jesus, and it was delivered once and for all.[2] It is not an "implicite Faith, a slavish ignorance," such as Roman Catholicism teaches.[3] Scripture and experience teach that true faith is grounded in spiritual knowledge which is discerned by the highest kind of sight.[4] By faith man sees spiritual things invisible to carnal eyes, but such invisible things are light not darkness or ignorance.[5] Over against men of arts and sciences Rous uses this same claim and extends it by saying that Christians hold religion "by a more Reasonable hand,

6

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 40. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 386. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 132. [5] *Ibid.*

and clearer wisdom, then they do their arts and Sciences."[1] Religion sees and knows by a most excellent sight what it trusts, so what could be more reasonable?

Faith is the result of the Spirit of God shining in the heart of man revealing God's redemptive activity in Christ Jesus. Christ shown as a sufficient redeemer is not without a seal for power accompanies the illuminating light.[2] But neither the light nor the power is sufficient evidence for the unbeliever for even if the believer could prove the reality of his experience the unbeliever could not conceive of it. Rous uses the illustration of the spiritual man seeing the sun needs no proof while the carnal man as blind cannot see the sun nor be convinced of its reality nor conceive it in his mind.[3]

Rous also feels that understanding does not have to surrender in religion or "have its eyes put out," but it only yields up the weaker sight to receive a stronger sight and light. The imparted light should be a better and more certain light because it is received "more newly and immediately from the maker" while our natural sight descends to us from Adam and through many men "much foyled and dimmed" because of sin.[4] Moreover, he feels Christianity is no more at fault than any other science or art when it requires beginners to trust their teachers. All three start with faith and proceed to knowledge. But, though the Church must first teach her children until they are taught by Christ, it is true that "then indeed they are only true and formed Christians, when Christ himself hath taught them."[5] At this point Rous passed beyond a conception of Christianity expressed in theological terminology to be accepted and defended as a system of dogma.

---

[1] _Ibid_. [2] _Ibid_., p. 133. [3] _Ibid_., pp. 133-134, 135.
[4] _Ibid._, p. 135. [5] _Ibid_., p. 136.

The only trouble is that one cannot accurately communicate these spiritual truths to unbelievers, and they will not allow that the truths of Christianity be accepted on a faith that they cannot see.[1] This is not desirable, but it cannot be helped, and believers would have it no other way for they see what they believe "by the highest, purest, and most undeceivable light," and they do not need "the Glow-warm of demonstration to tell us, that we see the chiefest Light Christ Jesus by our Faith; and the Light, which we see is the same Light by which we see."[2]

The place of faith is primarily in the understanding, but working down into the will and affections it joins the believer to Christ. It is the hand of the "ingraffer" excellent for union and all the benefits derived therefrom.[3] The knowledge of God in Christ must pass from the understanding to the will or it is not faith but mere formal knowledge.[4] The understanding must move the will "to open it self wide unto happiness, and being open, to suck, cleave, and fasten itself by an ardent love, rest, and settlement unto happiness certainily discovered in Christ by the understanding."[5]

Until the understanding and will of man have gone that far they have not done enough to bring home to the soul the knowing of God in Christ even to the welcoming of the Spirit as one surrenders and rests in him.[6] Anything short of total surrender is not acceptable to mercy. Rous describes the process of surrender or faith in these words: ". . . . let the will follow the understanding, and wholly and unmoveably will and love this Treasure of felicity, discovered in Christ Jesus, forsaking, selling, and abandoning all things for it; I say, let the will stick to Christ alone by a fervent love and desire, as unto the alone happiness, and let the same will stick to Christ alone by a strong trust and confidence, as the alone Mediator of happiness; and finally with an earnest hunger and thirst, let it surrender up it self, and all things subject to it, unto his saving or imparting of blessedness, which he doth by the Spirit."[1]

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid., p. 527.

[4] Ibid., p. 40 [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid., p. 41.

That is the highest and mightiest endeavor of the soul "famous in holy wisdom for knitting souls unto the same Saviour."[2] It is both fit to receive and proportionate to Christ's manner of entering. The soul is as a door wide open to receive Christ, or as a window wide open to him who enters by a "lightsom and illuminating Spirit."[3] Also, the will has a power to hold and knit to itself what it has received; therefore, the spouse of Christ is knit to Christ and runs after him being tied by the "knot of happiness."[4] Logically the doctrine of the spiritual marriage emerges at this point again, but we will reserve treatment of it in relation to the understanding and the will for the following chapter.

The important thing to note here is the heavy emphasis placed upon the ability and necessity of man to make a total surrender of his will. Though the necessity of effectual grace is maintained, it is so obscured by repeated exhortations to look upon any favourable stirring of the spiritual life as grace in operation, that its importance is overshadowed by what amounts to practical voluntarism. Rous went so far as to say that if man has reached the point where he seems to prefer Christ above all other things, one is "in good preparation for the receipt of this blessedness" and man is then drawing "neer unto it."[1] If Christ is known, willed, and trusted as the chief good, then man gladly lets the Spirit enter to cut off and slay the fleshly nature.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[2] Ibid., p. 41.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

The Spirit entering kills the old Adam and gives a new life, both of which actions pertain primarily to the understanding and will.[3] The result is that the renewed soul clasps "the will and affections about him" and lays "fast hold on the Lord of glory and blessedness," while the soul "kisseth him with the kiss of her mouth, and as she needed him most before she found him, so she loveth him best after she hath found him."[4] The work of the Spirit is of paramount importance throughout man's endeavor to apprehend salvation; nevertheless, it sometimes appears as if faith or total surrender are not so much the result of effectual grace as they are of a mighty volitional act on the part of man.

In concluding the section on the activity of the Holy Spirit in effecting and executing man's salvation something must be said about the problem of revelation. The problem was particularly acute in Puritanism with regard to the relation between the Spirit and Scripture.

Rous had a very high conception of Scripture, but he did not neglect the operation of the Spirit in relation to it. He really possessed a dialectical conception of the relation between the two. On the one hand the Scripture is a revelation from God to man revealing the mystery of God's will for man and activity in behalf of man.[5] Thus Scripture holds an important place in the world for it alone shines as a light to the world directing man to God and bestowing spiritual doctrines.[1] It is the "treasure of perfect knowledge" of the art of happiness and offers man the beginnings of his happiness and continues to give him strength as he grows in grace.[2]

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 42. [2] _Ibid._ [3] _Ibid._

[4] _Ibid._, pp. 49-50. [5] _Ibid._, pp. 46, 558.

Scripture has authority and is self upholding simply because it is the word of God.[3] Throughout the history of the Church men have found God's judgments and mercies in it.[4] All true Christian doctrine can be found in it, and man's conscience is safe only when grounded on Scripture.[5] It is the great "second Mercy" by which God reaches out and delivers to man the first mercy enacted in Christ Jesus.[6]

The other side of the dialectic is that the Scripture makes good its purpose only in conjunction with the Spirit. In the worship services God's Spirit meets man in the Word and sacraments and offers to write the word into man's heart that he might clearly perceive it to be God's wisdom.[7] Scripture teaches spiritual truths which can be discerned only by spiritual minds, so it is only in light of the Spirit that man really experiences the Biblical message.[8] Before one receives the Spirit to discern, he depends upon the commendation of the Church, but after receiving the Spirit he judges even the Church by the Spirit through the word.[9]

There is also an inward word as well as the outward word. The former operates through the Spirit and is borne to man only through the outward word entering the outward ear.[10] When man hears the word, he should earnestly seek and hope for the inward word carried by the Spirit.[1] Too many men divide the two or exclude the inner word. Neither of these judgments is correct.[2] The fact is that through the inner word one sees Christ himself.[3] If we are spiritual and look into the word and seals of the word, we look on Christ himself for his image is stamped upon the word.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 51, 52. [2] Ibid., p. 52.

[3] Ibid., pp. 216, 506, 507. [4] Ibid., pp. 216, 358, 262.

[5] Ibid., p. 233. [6] Ibid., p. 46.

[7] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 128-129.

[8] Rous, Treatises, pp. 652, 203. [9] Ibid., pp. 506-507.

[10] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 131-132.

The same dialectic is preserved in his treatment of the relation between the Spirit illuminating and the written word. The same Spirit which now shines in our souls did first shine in the word, so the light in our souls and the light in the word "are twinnes and resemble each other, and agree like brethren."[5] The two cannot contradict each other for they are "near of kin" and "being brethren, they must needs cherish, love, and strengthen each other."[6] The relation is threefold, the Spirit is approved by the word, approves the word, and improves the word.[7] By the latter Rous means that through the Spirit man sees secrets in Scripture or will find a "Mine of heavenly doctrine" in "some single word," or "at a little crany discover a world of divine truths."[8]

The dialectical relation was clearly expressed by Rous when he said:

> The Word is the Looking-glass bearing the Image of the Spirit that speaketh, and therein is the Spirit speaking discerned by the Spirits hearing. The more this Spirit is discerned, the more beauty, and so the more love, and

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 135, 136, 134.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 132. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 129-130, 35.

[4] Rous, *Treatises*, pp. 47, 52, 53.

[5] Rous, *Mysticall Marriage*, p. 235. Rous, *Heavenly Academie*, pp. 130-131.

[6] Rous, *Treatises*, pp. 51, 158, 507.

[7] Rous, *Mysticall Marriage*, p. 238.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 237-238.

> so the more power. Now the clearer the Glass is, the more discerning; therefore, the spirit made more excellent in an evident word is more lovely and more powerful.[1]

A few words might be said about Rous's method of Biblical interpretation. He enunciated no formal principles of hermeneutics but like most Puritan theologians said the dark passages must be interpreted by the light or clear passages. This implied that there was a main frame or body to Scripture, and it could be understood by all who piously and carefully read and interpreted the Bible.[2] Those passages that cannot be understood should be set aside not as nonsense or unimportant but as secrets that our knowing in part cannot comprehend.[3] Nevertheless, in spite of his attempt to use only a literal interpretation, Rous's mystical theology led him to use allegorical interpretation quite frequently and even defend it as offering interpretations more agreeable to the dignity of God.[4]

In conclusion one can say that in one respect Rous's treatment of the Holy Spirit was within the central stream of Puritan tradition. There was the closest of conjunction between the Spirit and the letter, and neither was of great value divorced from the other. The question of the Spirit speaking apart from the word or contrary to the word was unthinkable for Rous.

The point at which Rous went beyond many Puritan thinkers was in the Spirit's relation to the mystical union. The great emphasis placed upon this point became the basis for the effecting and continuation of his bridal mysticism. The doctrine of the mystical union effected by the Holy Spirit as the means whereby man appropriated Christ's gifts was no longer just one doctrine among several others, but it became the center of Rous's religious experience and ethical life.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 183.

[2] Ibid., p. 651.

[3] Ibid., p. 652. Cf., Mysticall Marriage, p. 182.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 18.

Mystical union was no longer just the means of appropriating Christ's gifts, it became the means of a conformity to God, of the vision of God at specific states or elevated moments, and of the religious dynamic that undergirded all ethical activity. Thus the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Francis Rous's theology was not involved in a millennarianism or in any type of legalism with regard to Biblical practices. It was oriented towards mystical piety and practical ethical living.

Francis Rous represents a trend in the readaptation of Puritan theology that emphasizes the personal aspect of religion while not wishing to transcend or supercede the external or historical aspects. True religion was purely spiritual religion, but was always mediated through external words, sacraments, and church which were instruments of the Spirit. Thus he differed from William Dell, Thomas Collier, William Erbury and other "Finders" who tended to spiritualize all worship and media almost to the exclusion of any set or legitimate forms.[1] It is also at this point that he differed from a man such as Sir Harry Vane Junior who also thoroughly spiritualized the second coming, the ministry, and the sacraments.[2] Rous was neither a spiritual millenarian like Vane, Dell, Erbury and friends nor a literal millenarian like Winstanly, the Diggers, or Fifth Monarchists.

He was a Puritan mystic who found external means not indifferent but valuable as stepping stones to true happiness. More will be said concerning this in the chapter on life in the spirit. The really important thing for Rous was a faith that surrendered the soul to Christ so a spiritual marriage took place. That was the "knot of blessedness" that made a new man and gave him a sanctified life through the Spirit bringing Christ. Here was no literalism, legalism, or total spiritualization of all externals. Eschatology was relegated to a very subordinate place in favor of the mystical union which comprised the most intensive work of the Spirit. Heaven and hell were not omitted or spiritualized but were seen simply as the full enjoyment of the beatific vision or total punishment of the unbeliever at the conclusion of this life.

---

[1] Johnson, op. cit., pp. 72f., 76 f, 86 ff.

[2] Vane, An Epistle General, pp. 32ff. Vane, The Face of the Times, passim.

The past two chapters have shown, then, that Francis Rous, though not a theologian in the strict sense of the word, articulated a theology in his exhortative treatises that was largely within the Augustinian-Calvinistic tradition and deviated in but few respects from contemporary Puritanism. The two outstanding points of difference were in his use of certain metaphors and concepts commonly employed by adherents of a Lichtmetaphysik and in his extension of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to the point where it became the basis for his Christ mysticism and doctrine of the mystical marriage. On the whole, Rous's doctrines of God the creator, man, the fall, and redemption through Christ Jesus were the usual Puritan treatment; thus Francis Rous the mystic can also be called Francis Rous the Puritan. And this applies not only to his ethics but also to his doctrine.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE MYSTICAL MARRIAGE

The most interesting and important aspect of Francis Rous's theological thought is his doctrine of the mystical marriage. Here is presented a full-blown and consciously held mystical theology. In flashes of rapturous language and in a series of unique but pointed similes, he expounds his mysticism. Such a theology is interesting in that type man primarily because he was a Puritan layman. But it is doubly interesting because of his beauty of expression and fervor of devotion. Like all of his theological thought his mysticism is not systematically expounded nor concerned with basic intellectual problems. It is devotional in tone and exhortatory in form.

At no risk of overstatement one can unreservedly say that the heart of Rous's theology was his conception of the mystical marriage. It was the symbol used to express, insofar as was possible, his deepest religious experiences, and it was to furnish a basis for his thoroughgoing Puritan ethic. From his first to his last treatise he had some reference to both the Church as the bride of Christ and the soul of the believer as the spouse of the Lamb. One of his most beautiful treatises, wholly devoted to mystical theology, was entitled _The Mysticall Marriage_.[1]

This chapter intends to establish Francis Rous as a mystic of no mean ability, who, though a Puritan, also stood within the finest traditions of early and medieval Christian mysticism. Also, classifying him as a mystic sets him apart from his many Puritan brethren who have been called mystics but who are in reality spiritualists. The distinction has consequences with regard to the conception of the church and sacraments and so, ultimately, with respect to sociological activities.

---

[1] It appeared in 1635 and was the only treatise Rous devoted exclusively to that subject. It is peculiar that so little attention has been paid to it by scholars of mysticism to say nothing of those interested in the readaptation of Puritan theology or in English literature.

Rous was not a spiritualist but a mystic in the truest sense of the term. He not only quoted and depended upon such men as Augustine, Pseudo-Dionysius, Bernard, Gregory, Richard the Victorine, Gerson, and Thomas á Kempis but his writings also abounded in the use of mystical terminology. His use of the image of the mystical marriage as the high point of the Christian experience had a profound effect on his conception of salvation and the Holy Spirit. Salvation consisted not so much in fellowship of the sinner with a righteous God who established the relation through forgiveness as it did in a gradual deification of man through a conformity with God produced by the successive visitations of the Bridegroom to strengthen the blessed knot of union. The Holy Spirit was the means whereby this operation occurred and was also the means whereby man was brought to see God in an attenuated vision at present and in an eternal full vision hereafter.

In sketching his doctrine of the mystical marriage a different procedure will be followed in this chapter. The attempt will be made to let the mystic speak for himself through the quotation of numerous excerpts.[1] This will enable the reader to ascertain the various emphases of Rous's mysticism and to gain some slight indication of the style and language he employed. Unfortunately the latter intention will be greatly weakened by the necessity of selecting and arranging material primarily with a theological end in view. The main body of this chapter will aim only at co-ordinating and commenting on the quotations in such a way that Rous's mysticism will be clearly articulated.

---

[1] Such was the method employed by Dom Cuthbert Butler in his admirable treatment of Western Mysticism.

Though the mystical marriage and the doctrine of union with Christ appear in almost all his treatises, he expounds the conception most fully in three treatises which provide the bulk of quotations for this chapter. They are The Mysticall Marriage, The Heavenly Academie, and The Art of Happiness. Again let it be emphasized, the conception did appear in all of his other major treatises.

## A. Autobiographical

There is little justification in labeling a man a mystic unless that man has partaken of a mystical experience or practices the mystical theology which he preaches. It is true that some men might be reticent to speak of such experiences or find few opportunities to confess it, but usually the genuine mystic will be at pains to point out that he is not propounding a second hand theology but only that which he actually has felt. It is in such a spirit that Rous says:

> Accordingly having received a measure of grace from this heavenly Teacher, by which I am what I am, I could not but acknowledge it, and by the acknowledgement return him glory for grace. And because I desire also that others may have like grace, that God also from others may have the like glory, I testify to others that which I have felt and seen. I have evidently seen and felt that men are taught of God . . . . so should they yet mount to a higher . . . .even a celestiall Academie.[1]

These words are to be understood in light of the content of the Heavenly Academie. The object was to show man the difference between the teaching of man and the teaching of God in the respective spheres of the method of the teaching, the content of the teaching, and the result of the teaching. As will be noted as we go along, all three of those were highly mystical in the school of God.

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, preface. Also see above, Chap. II, p. 50, where Rous speaks of the personal experience that drove him to mysticism.

In speaking of his reason for writing The Mysticall Marriage Rous does not directly mention his own participation in the experience of which he writes, but the whole tenor of the statement is to the effect that this invisible land of promise is well known to him also. Let the reader judge his words where he says of his treatise:

> . . . .it presents to the view of the world some bunches of grapes brought from the land of promise, to show that this land is not a mere imagination, but some have seen it, and and have brought away pearls, pledges, and earnests of it. In these appears a world above the world, a love that passeth human love, a peace that passeth naturall understanding, a joy unspeakable and glorious, a taste of the chief, and soueraigne good.[1]

Any doubt about Rous's inclusion within the group of those who have seen the land of promise and brought away pledges of it is dispelled when one reads the last chapter of the same treatise. It is a "Song of Loves" written in the first person, and it summarized the entire contents of The Mysticall Marriage.[2] No man could have written such a passionate and fervent hymn to love in the first person unless he had actually partaken of the joys which he expounded. The following quotation is a consecutive summary from that chapter selected because it seems indicative of the mystical experience of Rous and offers a succinct summary of his mysticism.

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, preface.

[2] Ibid., pp. 317 f.

Thy spirit is a loadstone of love, and where it toucheth spirits, it leaveth love, and this love makes a soule to move to her beloved, that touched her. So by thee doth she run after thee, O thou fountaine and rest of loves; thy oyntments draw her to the anoynter, her loves begin and end in thee. O let my soule ever runne this circle of love; let her ever be tasting of thy loves, and ever love thee by tasting them. . . . . Give me the flagons of the new wine of the kingdome, which may lift up my soule above her selfe in her loves, and give her better loves then her owne, wherewith to love him that is farre better than her selfe. Yea let her drinke plentifully, that she maybe mounted up in a divine extasie above her carnall and earthly station; that she may forget the low and base griefs, and cares, and distractions of carnall and worldly love, and by an heavenly excesse be transplanted into an heavenly love, to imbrace her beloved, who is the Lord from heaven, with a love that is like him. . . . . But then thy loveliness is lost to me, because love loves not, what it sees not. Therefore ever anoynt mine eyes with thine eye salve, that my soule may ever see thy loveliness, and seeing it to be most lovely, love it with her best loves, and despise a world of beauties in comparison of thine, and a world of loves in comparison of those loves wherewith shee loveth thee. Let my love rest in nothing short of thee, neither let it be content meerely to rest in thee, but kindle it, enflame it, enlarge it, that it may rest largely in thee. Enlarge the crany which thy spirit hath bored through the flesh into my spirit, that I may largely love thee. Enlarge the arteries and conduit pipes by which thou the head and fountaine of loves, flowest into thy members. . . . . And doe not onely come much, but often into me, and let my spirit often be one spirit with thee in communicative and fruitive unions. . . . . Wherefore by often visitations, put thy owne image and beauty more and more on my soule, and then love thy own beauty in my soule, and my soule for thy owne beauty, which thou hast put on her, and let my soule love thee infinetly for being infinetly more beautiful. . . . . Thy being is loveliness it selfe, and thy being is love it self, for God is love. Come therefore into me, O thou that art love, and love thyself into me.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Yea, let thy spirit of love come so fully into my soule, that it stretch and enlarge her measure, and make her to grow from the measure in which she is, unto the measure in which she should be; even to that stature which is appointed her in thy body. . . . . For when my understanding, my will, and affections are all overflowne, overcome, and amazed, then shall my wonder gaze on thee, and my very faintings shall be enflamed toward thee, and melt into thee. . . . . But I desire that the joy and sap of thy spirit powred into mine, when they two are one spirit may be generative fruitfull. . . . . Yea I will not cease to cry unto thee, Give mee children or else I die. For thou canst not reply unto mee; am I in Gods stead to give the fruit of the wombe. For verily thou art that God who giveth the fruit of the wombe, both spirituall and corporall. Give me therefor children by this union with thee even fruites of thy spirit which may resemble thee and be pledges to mee of thy union with mee. . . . . Make my soule a fruitfull paradise bearing every good fruit of love, divine

> and humane, and then come often into thy garden, to behold &gather the fruits of it. . . . . Thou art a burning and consuming fire, and the spirit by which thou art one with my spirit, baptizeth with fire; O let the fire of thy spirit, so wholly turne my soule into spirituall fire, that the drosse of the flesh & the world being wholly consummed may be onely spirituall, and so bring forth fruites onely to the spirit.
>
> . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
>
> But alas the husband of the soule is sometime like that husband which _is not at home, but is gone on a long journey_. He is gone so farre from mee, as if hee were not mine, yea so far sometimes, as if he were not at all. . . . . The often unions that are passed are wholly past, and the very images and representations of them, are neare wholly vanished.
>
> . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
>
> Then shall she be more humble by seeing her own vileness in thy absence, and thou shalt be more lovely and precious to her, whose presence gives her all worth and excellence. . . . . And be not lacking overlong, O thou life, and love, and guide of my soule, but ever and anon visit her with thy presence, stay her with thy flagons, comfort her with apples, for she is sicke of love, when shee wanteth her beloved. . . . . Be thou her guide even to the life which is beyond death. . . . There shall she see her beloved clearly and plainly, even face to face, and there shall shee enjoy her beloved so fully, as she seeth him clearly; yea she shal enjoy him, with all her might of enjoying. Her being shall be the measure of her enjoying; for as much as shee is, so much shall she enjoy: she shall be a perpetuall union with her beloved, and in a perpetuall fruition by union; and so in a perpetuall rank, extent, and uttermost of joy.[1]

Though that chapter does not contain all the doctrines of Rous's mysticism, it does possess sufficient facets to outline the main tenets of his theology. The most important thing missing is his doctrine of divine contemplation or the vision of God. In speaking of union with the divine he uses both the concept of the spiritual marriage and the vision of God, but in this particular treatise he is concerned only with the former. It is to be noted, however, that the spiritual marriage also is a means to the vision of God.[2] Following is a partial outline based on the material just quoted.

1) Union can be attained only through the operation of

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 318-347.

[2] _Ibid_., pp. 320, 322, 329-330.

the Spirit which burns and consumes the flesh and the world.

2) The Spirit must give the soul an "eye salve" that it can discern Christ's love and lovliness and so love spiritual things.

3) Through the love of the Lord which draws her by the Spirit, the soul is led into a spiritual marriage with Christ. Through his frequent visitations to the soul, the soul is enlarged in her love and being and is made more like her Lord whose beauty and love she sees through a "crany" which his Spirit has bored through the flesh.

4) The object or end of the union and heavenly visitations is not merely unspeakable joy and spiritual ectasy but is also that the human spirit might bear offspring in the form of works of love.

5) The visitations are transitory, and the vision is but partial in this life. Times come when one does not see the Saviour and no longer feels the bliss and joy of heavenly visitations. Only in eternity will the soul see her beloved "face to face" and be in a "perpetuall union" with him.

That one short autobiographical chapter presents a mystical theology in skeleton outline. It remains now to fill out the body through abundant quotations that enable one to note what type of mystic Francis Rous was. He did not employ a scholastic or systematic presentation of the threefold mystic path--purgation, illumination, and union. But, as in all genuine mystics, these three factors were quite apparent in his theology even though they lacked a systematic exposition.

## B. Purgation

The following statements by Rous clearly indicate the typical mystic's concern for the necessity of purgation. Rous uses a familiar mystic idea when he says: "For it is a true Rule, that none but the pure in heart can see God again, None can be pure in heart, but he must first be new-begotten by God, even a son and heir of God."[1]

In another place he says: "But let the soul that prepareth herself for God, untie her self from her self as from a thing corrupted, and from the world as from a multitude of such things as her self is; equally blinded and walking in the same darkness though among themselves they be agreed to call it light."[2]

Introversion was described as follows:

> Now the immediate use of this knowledge being to the knower, he that will make most use thereof, must learn to know himself most in those parts and faculties, which are of most use and excellence. Therefore on the soul, let the soul of man espically fasten her eys that knowing herself with a right and true knowledge, she may finde what is right in her to continue and confirm it; and which is crooked and corrupted, to avoid and amend it.[3]

Another instance of introversion and recollection is the following: "But he that will seriously inquire for true happiness, must in his inquiry lay aside his body and the doctrines thereof, and he must retire into his innermost and most secret closet of Light and Reason, and there aske of his Soule assured truths and resolutions concerning his chief and soueraigne Good."[4]

The starting point of any mysticism is the necessity of purity in body and soul for only the pure in heart can see God. This requires the operation of the Holy Spirit who both regenerates fallen man and leads him onward in sanctification. The man who wishes to see God must cut himself off from all fleshly lusts and worldly diversions. He must turn inward and search the depth of his own soul. He must empty himself before he can be made full. All of this is but another way of expressing the classical mystic doctrines of recollection and introversion.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 89.

[2] Ibid., p. 520.

[3] Ibid., p. 519.     [4] Ibid., p. 1

1) Mortification or killing the flesh.-- This was dealt with in connection with regeneration as one aspect of the Holy Spirit's work, but here it is seen as a continuation in the process of sanctification whereby the believer prepares himself for a fuller enjoyment of his blessed union with Christ and vision of God. Rous describes the necessity of obtaining a new taste by saying that "the lovers of Egyptian Onions, are no true tasters of celestial Manna: therefore strive to cast out the old Man, corrupt with deceivable lusts, which makes thy taste gross and earthly, and then thou shalt taste the sweetness of God and his consolations."[1]

In another passage mortification is delineated as a preparation for a fuller union with Christ and for the resurrection.

> We would put off these bodies of dust and lust, that our soules may put on Christ in a full and frutive union. Yet neither would we wholly be uncloathed of our bodies, but put them off, to put their basenesse and sinfulnesse, and to put them on againe glorious and holy.[2]

In a most forceful passage Rous says: "Therefore whereas the flesh would make it thy pleasure to live after the flesh, doe thou make it thy pleasure to kill the flesh; let the hunting, pursuing, and killing of the lusts of the flesh be thy pastime and pleasure, even the hunting and destroying of these Foxes, that would destroy the vineyard."[3]

Rous embodies the same conception throughout the second chapter of The Mysticall Marriage where he maintains that the soul can have but one husband at once.[1] Before the soul can be married to Christ, it must first be cut loose from its adulterous husband, lust. If the soul will only surrender herself to the Spirit of Christ, he will slay concupiscence and prepare the soul for the spiritual marriage.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 181.

[2] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 223-224.

[3] Ibid., pp. 282-283. Cf., Rous, Treatises, p. 490-589.

2) Emptying oneself.-- This is another way of speaking about purification or killing the flesh. It can also be viewed as a way of recollection whereby the soul cuts loose from its own natural knowledge and turns the will from self seeking to total surrender. The entire process culminates in that point where Christ Jesus enters into the very bottom of man's heart which has opened in purity through a full surrender. Rous indicates the necessity for emptiness when he says: "And for a preparation toward this fullnesse, let him work out, and endevour to perfect his owne emptinesse: for the more degrees he gaines of this emptinesse the more degrees shall be received of Gods fulnesse; even of his teaching grace here, and his crowning grace for ever hereafter."[2]

a) Denial of man's natural knowledge.-- One of the ways that man empties himself is to deny his own wisdom as insufficient for spiritual taste and sight. Before one can see God or enjoy and realize the spiritual presence and gifts of the heavenly Bridegroom, he must have a spiritual mind and sight. This is given only to those who depend not on their own natural wisdom, and that necessitates the surrender of the understanding to a higher light.

Rous says: "And when thou goest up, to get a spirituall mind of the great Father of Spirits, remember to put off thy carnal wit and wisdome, which must be stript off before thou canst put on the other."[1]

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 17-42.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 114.

The same thing is indicated in the following statements:

> Therefore let the heavenly scholar put off his owne earthly and carnal wisdome, and goe up to God for a new Principle, even a new mind, by which he may truly see and know the things of God. The new world of Divinitie must be begun in a man, as God began the old world, it must have nothing added for a foundation; and when man is nothing in himselfe, then God will begin to create, and make him something.[2]

Rous continues: "As no man can see God and live, so no natural man can see Christ who is God, as long as he lives a meer natural man. He must die; and especially to his own wisdom; and his very sight, which he magnifies for clearness, must be acknowledged for blindness, and be brought to be cured by the lightsome Spirit of Christ, which then will show him from whom it self proceeded."[3]

b) Total surrender of man's will and affections.-- There can be no spiritual marriage or union with God unless man's will is "melted" into Christ's will.[4] There must be a "perpetuall consent of thy will unto his will" and an "issuing of thoughts and actions from this consent and conformity."[5] When there is but one will present then the husband will delight to come "home much" and give a "unity of fruition where is a unity of affection and will."[6]

The following is a selection of pertinent material regarding the surrender of the will that union might transpire. It is quoted consecutively and disregards paragraphing but indicates sentence and word omissions.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 105, 159, 161.

[2] Ibid., pp. 108-109. Cf., 102-103.

[3] Rous, Treatises, p. 506.

[4] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 273.

[5] Ibid., pp. 272-273.

[6] Ibid., p. 273.

> Now if this great affiance which worketh dedication, resignation, and so an application of the Soul, yea of the whole man unto Christ, be the Key of our hearts, which openeth those everlasting Doors, that the King of glory may enter in; let us take heed that this Key be put home unto the lock, that our hearts may be fully opened unto him; otherwise as much of our hearts as is shut unto him, so much of happiness is shut out of us. . . . . It seems that the understanding is but the Porch, but the Will attended with the affections, is the chief Room of Christs rest and residence. . . .and when the will toward the attainment of Christ, and the vertues of his mediation yieldeth itself up to no other humane invention, but fully and wholly surrenders itself up to the holy Ghost, regenerating and new-begetting, then is Christ sealed in thy heart, he is come into thee, and his feet tread on the very bottom of thy soul. Thou hast take up thy rest in him, and he hath taken up his rest in thee; and this is the inward Sabbath of this life, and an earnest and beginning of the eternal Sabbath. . . . . Thy knowledge of God in Christ must not be dead, but effectual and working, and the work thereof must be the kindling of a fervant love, dependence and affiance in thy will and affections. Thy will must work by this dependence and love; and the work thereof must be a dedication, and resignation of all unto God, in Christ, taking possession of thee by the Spirit. Till thou comest to this point, thou art short of happiness: For this is the center of descending to the Spirit of Christ; and in the very ground of the heart doth the Spirit only fasten his roots. . . . . It is not a rash presumption, nor a lose thought, that can snatch at Christ and make him thine; it must cost thee thyself before thou have him. . . . and it is not a bare imagination that makes way for this Kingdom, but an affiance of the heart, which actually and effectually surrenders us up to his Scepter and Rule. As much as thou hast gone out of thyself to possess him, so much hath he entered into thee to possess thee; so much as thou cleavest to Christ, and dost yieldest thyslef to the renewing of his Spirit, so much does thou knit Christ unto thee, and so much thou drawest, yea suckest his Spirit into the innermost part of thy soul. . . . . He who is goodness itself and died for us, when we were sinners, cannot restrain his Spirit from us, when with a full trust we have cast ourselves wholly upon him, and with a whole resignation have given up ourselves fully unto him. He who is love, cannot resist love, but he is overcome and taken by the fervor of our hungry and thirsty souls, and gives us to drink freely of the waters of Life.[1]

Two things are evidenced by this quote. First, the will and affections are the very ground of man's soul into which Christ pours his Spirit. Until they are purified and cleave wholly unto him, there is no spiritual marriage, union, or consequent taste of things divine. Secondly, when man has gone wholly out of self, then Christ enters in fully and treads on the very bottom of the soul. Only recollection and introversion can bring the soul to that point.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 42-44.

3) Dependence upon the spirit in devotional life.-- From what has been said above it is apparent that Rous's mysticism is not primarily intellectual but devotional. He exhibits little systematic concern for a doctrine of the soul or the ontological problems of mystical theology. While such problems did receive incidental treatment, they were never fully or consistently explicated.

By far the most important preparation for the mystical experience of heavenly visitations or the vision of God is the operation of the Spirit first in regeneration and then in sanctification. The latter consists in a strengthening of the Spirit within and a growth of the soul in conformity to her Husband. Herein Rous placed the necessity of works of love. He is insistent on the necessity of exercising the Spirit through such spiritual activities as prayer, meditation, watchfulness, and good works. Rous devotes the last third of his treatise The Art of Happiness to man's retaining and increasing his happiness through cultivation of the Spirit.

He feels that the Spirit "groweth by exercise, as bodily strength doth by bodily labour,"[1] so in not exercising it "we discomfort the Comfortor, we go into a spiritual consumption, we dead our life, we grudge ourselves the increase of felicity, when we resist or neglect the sacred instincts and blessed influences of this Soverign Spirit."[2] One of the things we stint is our increase of felicity, and, as we will note later, Rous defines our happiness as a union with God through Christ Jesus.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 31.

That man might be pure and continually growing in union and joy he should kill the flesh and encourage the spirit in such activities as watchfulness, patience, and prayer. Watchfulness keeps evil "at a good distance" by serving as a herald on top of a tower to sound the bell and warn of approaching evil.[1] Thus it serves a twofold purpose--it watches for the approach of evil both internally and externally, and it makes sure that the soul is always ready for the bridegroom.

God has given us souls enlightened and sanctified by the Spirit "that we might discern and forsee Satan's policies," so we must use those gifts.[2] If we abide in the light of the Spirit and the Word "we are escaped into the protection of the Father of Light, and in this light of his we walk into his own primitive Light."[3] The necessity of keeping one's thoughts and activities in line through watchfulness is expressed by Rous in these words:

> Put thy very first thought in order; for the further our thoughts run astray with Dinah, the more danger of ravishment, and the harder is their recovery. But the heart being set in time like a clock in the morning, it will go the truer all the day after. Wherefore set thy heart betimes in the way of God's commandments, commit it to the Spirit to be guided in this way; for the Spirit is the fiery chariot; that carrieth our souls through the way of Piety, to the country of Felicity.[4]

The other aspect of watchfulness as preparing and keeping ready the soul for a heavenly visitation is described by Rous where he says:

> We must open large windows in our hearts, that the Sun of righteousness may pour in a large light and heat, when he visiteth us in the mornings of grace. But far be it from us to be far from home, when God cometh to see us. Far be

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 55.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 58.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 59.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 56.

> it from us to let him pass as a stranger that lodgeth not for a night.[1]

Patience and humility are not only results of heavenly grace but are also virtues to be practiced that the soul might increase her union with Christ and the enjoyment of her true felicity. Patience gives one control over all his senses and abilities, prevents confusion, makes room for faith, enables one to endure the world, and is the key whereby the "Spirit of Blessedness" comes in.[2] It is indispensable for the soul which longs for continued marriage union with Christ or for a growth in felicity.

Humility is a fore-runner of grace and a necessity for the spiritual life.[3] It sweeps and trims the soul that the spirit can enter, and it empties man that the fulness of God can enter.[4] So Rous says: "Wherefore let us strive for a practical skill of this profitable humilitie; that by not loving ourselves, we may love our souls best; and by the greatest emptiness, we may purchase the most true and happy fulness."[5] Only through humility, which gives all glory to God, is the soul of man made fit for the entrance of God.

> For God enters not into the soul that acknowledgeth him not or his benefits: those that are farr from beholding him, he beholdeth a far off. But unto the humble soul, that giveth him abundance of glory, he answers with abundance of grace: sowing there, and there only plenty of grace, where he is assured to reap plenty of glory.[6]

True humility is a constant struggle against the remainder of the natural man, and even fasting is a part of it. Rous is at pains to point out that fasting is not to be done in an ostentatious way nor for merit, but it is a proper part of repentance and keeps "the body servicable to the soul."[1] Humility keeps man constantly on guard against taking pride in anything that God has given, and God has given all to a Christian. This is expressed as follows:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 59.

[2] Ibid., pp. 80-87.

[3] Ibid., p. 77.

[4] Ibid., p. 78.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., p. 588.

> But the true Christian, even the new born Son of God, rips up this swelling deceit, and strives to free his soul from it, and to bring her to a true and just discerning of things. To this end bending her eye to the comtemplation of truth, she finds that chief and only glory, belonging to the Giver, not to the receiver; to the Creator, not the thing made.[2]

The two special activities of spiritual men that prove of most value in helping man to the vision of God or to spiritual marriage are prayer and meditation. Both are part of the purgative process for by them the soul is freed from carnal allurements and brought within herself where the Spirit will operate. Prayer is "an inseparable companion of watchfulness" and is a special work among "furtherances of the spirit" for it goes directly "to the fountain of the Spirit, and seeks the gift of the Giver himself."[3]

On the one hand it is of great value to fill the heart with "profitable and eternal truths" to the exclusion of "dying and killing vanities," and enables God alone to possess the heart.[4] Man has been encouraged by God to seek the Spirit through prayer, for God loves the spiritual prayer which results.[5] Come to God with faith and fervency in prayer and you will obtain, says Rous.[6] The place of prayer in obtaining the Spirit for the work of mortification is indicated thus by Rous: ". . . . . Whereas by strong mortification of this fleshly wisdom, and the help of the Spirit obtained by earnest Prayer, hunger, and thirst, the flesh being made quiet and unmoving, and the Spirit opening the blind eyes of his, and our souls, he and we might perceive the reason why we could not perceive them."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 267.

[2] Ibid., p. 585.

[3] Ibid., p. 61.

[4] Ibid., p. 577.

[5] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 147-149.

[6] Ibid., p. 147.

On the other hand Rous speaks of prayer in one place as if it were specifically contemplative prayer whereby one looked on the vision of God. In that interpretation prayer was termed a "little salvation." The passage goes as follows:

> And surely, as Prayer is honourable and profitable, so it is pleasant and comfortable, for we may term it a little salvation, since the soul in Prayer, clearing herself by Faith from fleshly darkness, looketh directly to the face of God, the vision of whom is our present beatitude: if light be pleasant, it is far more pleasant to behold the Father of light: which, though it be but by the glimpses of faith, yet so much as it is, so much happiness it is. The soul, for the time, is in heaven, and beholdeth God; yea beholdeth God beholding her with a gracious countenance, through an elder Brother Christ Jesus.[2]

Though he never worked out a contemplative theory of prayer, Rous did indicate at several places,[3] such as the one just mentioned, that in prayer the soul looks on the vision of God. In most places, however, Rous looked upon prayer as means of procuring the Spirit or of preparing the soul for a heavenly visitation.

Meditations, says Rous, might be concerned with all that is, but primarily they should deal with the soul's happiness and the way to it.[4] Through them the soul thinks on her relation to the Creator and creation. And she notes the remaining evil and concupiscence in her life and so attacks it with "zeal, indignation, and revenge" which often eventuates in "mourning, fasting and asperity."[5] Well might the soul keep constant watch on her relations to creation and creatures for the flesh is like "ceyment which joynes the soule to the world."[1] Meditation prevents such a permanent juncture occurring says Rous: "For us when we would not have things to glue and fasten, we doe often touch, and turne, & move them; so the soule being apt to glue & fasten to the world we must by these and the like meditations often touch and remove her, that so she may be kept continually loose from it."[2]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 541. [2] Ibid., p. 61.

[3] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 175, 176.

[4] Ibid., p. 67. [5] Ibid., p. 69.

Again, he points out that meditations purify the soul from dross and prepare her for the Spirit and spiritual sights.

> And when thou goest to this Schoole, let meditation purge thy soule from carnall drossinesse, and fire it into a spirituall puritie. Let this spirituall fire burne away that corporeal grossennesse, which entertaines and makes carnall and bodily images. Let the glasse of thy soule bee cleansed, and made spiritually pure, that it may be fit to entertaine a pure spirit, and those spirituall sights, which the Spirit shall present into it.[3]

But all this negative work of meditation, then, is only the necessary descent into the foot of the valley for those that "will ascend to the height of the Mountain of God."[4] All these steps in purgation are necessary for "without abstinence Meditation lesseneth her Light: without Meditation, Prayer lesseneth her might; but Meditation joyned to Abstinence, mounteth the higher: and Prayer mounted on Meditation, pierceth the swifter, and reacheth neerer to Heaven."[5] In one eloquent and concise paragraph Rous summarizes meditation in these words:

> Hereby the beams of the heavenly Spirit are contracted into a point upon the soul, as the beams of the Sun by a Chrystal, whereby the light and heat of grace are increased and multiplied into a spiritual Fire. The soul goeth in from the flesh into the Spirit, and bathing and anointing her self in that Oyl of gladness, she sharpneth her flight, and quickneth her might, and becomes much abler to see into heaven, to see into her self, and to see and judge the things on

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 280.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 151-153.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 70.

[5] Ibid., p. 72.

earth.[1]

There is one more specific way Rous exhorts the believer to prepare for or to increase the union of the soul with God. In distinction from the means already mentioned, though it overlaps prayer and meditation, it might be termed stirring up the spirit within. Rous said that a man fighting a fire fights like three men because he is aroused to an intense pitch. Because his soul is on fire and endangered by the fires of temptation a man should also stir up the grace of God within and reach a new level of fervency.[2]

God has given man a spirit of power, and we see that when it is stirred up great strength is given; therefore man should not lose this strength that might give victories over sins and temptations. Nor should man use "onely cold contemplations, and say over some speculative sentences wherewith to overcome temptations, as with charms."[3] Let man rather set upon evils with the power and gifts of the "spirit stirred up and kindled in us by fervent prayers and good resolutions" that he might accomplish hitherto impossible tasks.[4]

Rous frequently used the same technique with regard to attaining and holding the Bridegroom in the spiritual marriage. He often employed such language as this: "And if hee come not yet into thee stirre up thy spirituall concupiscence, and therewith let the soule lust mightily for him, and let her lusts and desires ascend up to him in strong cryes and invocations, & then by his spirit he will descend unto thee."[5]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 67. [2] _Ibid_., p. 599.

[3] _Ibid_., pp. 599-600. [4] _Ibid_.

[5] Rous, _Mysticall Marriage_, p. 272.

The soul could help to procure a heavenly visitation by kindling her love "like burning coals," and making it "flame" by thinking on the beauty of his "sweetness" in past visitations. "And so if thy minde be fitted, and put into a state of enjoying, it is likely that he will come into a minde so fitted, and thou shalt enjoy him."[1] Recollection of past visitations was one way to renew the Bridegroom's coming because "as they have beene heretofore seene and tasted, they will even now present themselves afresh to be tasted and seen by thee."[2]

A similar emphasis upon devotional activity is noted in the effort to retain Christ's presence in the soul for "having procured his coming, thou shalt also stay him from going: thy heart shall watch him, and keepe him, and holde him; for where he is so watched and held from going he is willing to abide."[3]

4)Intellectual ascent.-- Thus far all steps of the purgative way on the path to union have been largely devotional in technique. That is, they aimed primarily at freeing the soul from the world and from lust through certain spiritual exercises dependent upon the operation of the Holy Spirit. There has been little reference to a search of all created things that man might ascend from them to the source of all things. In that respect Rous was more like Bernard or Ruysbroeck than Augustine or Bonaventura. However, it is not to be maintained that Rous did not also employ an anagogical ascent from creature to Creator.

One of the opening sentences of his treatise The Art of Happiness is: "But, amidst the infinite changes of things seemingly good, how shall man find out that one thing which is really and perfectly good?"[1] Rous's anthropology was of such a nature that he was almost certain to employ the anagogical way of ascent.[2] Man standing in the great chain of being was seeking his true happiness. He could find it in himself, in the creatures or creation, or in the Creator. But, says Rous, the creation is not the true end of man but only directs one's thoughts to the Creator.[3] Concerning things of creation he said: "Thus the things sealed, bearing the Image of the seal, teach us the seal, even these visible Creatures, bearing the impression of the Deity, represent to us the same Deity, as their Cause and Beginning, and in their dumb language they preach unto us their original.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 272.

[2] Ibid., pp. 209-210.

[3] Ibid., pp. 269-270.

It is commonplace in natural wisdom that an author is more excellent than his work or a cause than an effect, and if it is pleasant to see and know the work or effect it is more pleasant to see the cause or author himself. But says Rous: ". . . . . whereas graveling Nature applyes this rule onely to these lower things, we knowing that the truth thereof proceeds further, yea reacheth especially to the cause of causes: let us outstrip Nature and follow this truth, until it lead us into an amazing wonder, a fervent love, a longing desire, to see that great producer of all excellent works, that infinite being, from whom all this mass of Creation hath his Being, and who as far exceedeth in wisdom, power, and glory, as an infinite and indeterminable cause, may effects finite and determined."[5]

Thus, starting with nature and creation Rous proceeds to measure each as the true end of man and finds them lacking. So he says:

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 1.

[2] See above, Chapter II, pp. 60 ff.

[3] Rous, Treatises, p. 500.

[4] Ibid., p. 17.

[5] Ibid., p. 500.

> Man is enforced to climb above this world of vanity to reach his true felicity. His soul must set up the ladder of contemplation, and thereon she must ascend up to her Maker, to seek in him a remedy of her misery, an object of blessedness, of perpetuity.[1]

He exhibited the same approach in one section of the Heavenly Academie. The steps of the ascent to the academy were outlined, but the first step, basic to all others, was the necessity of proposing a right end.[2] Rous quoted Augustine as the authority substantiating that contention.[3] Finally, in one passage Rous united the fervent devotional technique with the intellectual quest in these words:

> Yea, he so highly preferreth Christ above all things, that he accounteth all things dung so he may win Christ. Christ is the mark of his desire, he sees nothing beyond him, but all things far short of him: He knows Christ to be infinetly better than all things, and therefore useth the worse as helps to the better: but farr it is from him, to propose the better only as a means unto the worse. So he passeth through all other things as a Pilgrime, but takes up his rest in Christ alone.[4]

Such healthy interest in creatures and creation as steps to the divine, prevented Rous from falling into an extreme internalizing of truth which could conceivably end in acosmism, and it also preserved his theology from an extravagant distinction between the natural and supernatural. His treatment of preparation or purgation makes quite clear that he was not engaged in a thorough process of abstraction that the soul might be made fit for God as an Absolute conceived in such terms as the "divine dark," "the wild waste," or the "super-essential Essence." Preparation of the soul was primarily a psychological or spiritual process necessary because man was a sinner, and it was not concerned with a philosophical process of abstraction necessary that man might be unified with that which is above all positive statements or experiences.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 10. Cf., Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 214-218, 279-280.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 93-101.

[3] Ibid., p. 95. [4] Rous, Treatises, p. 584.

## C. The Act of Contemplation or Union.

Thus far it has been indicated from numerous quotations that Francis Rous was a mystic in his personal religious experience and in the theology he professed. To this point the step of purgation or preparation, including the necessity of "new lighting" by the Spirit, has been outlined. Now it becomes our task to investigate the union of the soul with God or what earlier western mystics termed the act of contemplation.

Rous summarized the goal of spiritual teaching as the vision of God and its consequent blessings throughout eternity.

> These drops and dewes of grace, by which you are now taught, shall bring you to the sight and fruition of the Teacher himselfe, who is an ever-flaming Fountaine, and boundless Ocean of light, wisdom, grace, & glorie. Then the most glorious Sun-light and influence of Gods presence, irradiating and overflowing thee, and so more than fully teaching thee, shall drowne the Starlight of this teaching, which thou receivedst here below. Yet shall thou magnifie this lesser teaching, because it hath brought thee to this great and glorious Teacher, whose light shall give thee the sight of the highest wisdome; whose presence shall inebriate thee with the fulness of joy, whose right hand shall give thee the pleasures of eternitie.[1]

Again the final vision of man is described in terms of light when Rous says: " The son of God new made by his Spirit, shall appear in the image and likeness of God his Father, with light in his understanding, righteousness in his affections: To him it shall be said, Blessed is the pure in heart, he shall see God, for God delighteth to see him, even in his own likeness in him."[1]

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 187-189.

In another place he wrote:

> In the purity of Substance, the Soul shall be highly clarified, untill it be capable of the uppermost and chiefest light. And the body shall be lifted up into a proportion with the soul; for the body shall then be a spiritual Body, even a Body like a Soul; even so pure shal they both be, that they shall admit unto themselves the beams of the Fountain of Light, untill they be filled with Light and Glory. God will be their Sun, and he will shine into them as unto Christall, and in his Light they shall have the fulness of Light.[2]

Finally, the vision is described in intellectual terms:

> For whereas now we do but flutter about the branches & extremities of Widsom, then shall we behold Wisdom in the root: The Glory & Fabrick of the Creature shall be seen in the Original, even in the Creator; in whom it was first made within, before it was made without. In him shall we read the Resolution of all profitable unknown truths; & his wisdom shall be a most perfect Oracle, instructing all glorified & blessed Souls.[3]

Rous speaks of an eternal beatific vision in many places.[4] But, the interesting fact is that he usually describes the vision in terms of light and wisdom. That is almost certain proof that Rous did stand within the tradition of, at least, a modified Lichtmetaphysik. Such terminology referring to God as "an ever-flaming Fountaine and boundless Ocean of light, wisdome, grace & glorie,"[5] the "Sun-light," of his presence,[6] "the uppermost and the chiefest Light,"[7] the Fountaine of Light,"[8] "the supreme sovereign light,"[9] is indicative of the source and direction of his thought.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 552. [2] Ibid., p. 90. [3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., pp. 87-90, 480, 486, 489-490, 539, 549, 577-578, 608; Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 100; Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 163-165. In all those places Rous speaks of the end of man as beholding God in an eternal, beatific vision.

[5] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 187-188.

[6] Ibid., p. 188. [7] Rous, Treatises, p. 90.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 59-60.

The eternal vision of God is described as the fulfillment and completion of the present vision in union or in spiritual marriage. Man in order to more fully partake of a beatifical vision of "light" must be made more fully light himself. That is what happens in eternity. The carnal "darksome" body will be made "spirituall and lightsome;" so man will be all "clarity and purity" or "all eye," and according to his capacity of receiving light and joy so will it enter into him.[1] The soul will have then passed on to the "bright day of eternity" and will be through with the "star light" of this life.[2] She has passed to a "full, large, and everlasting fruition" of her visitations and visions.[3] God is, accordingly, seen as the "chief and sovereign good,"[4] and man enjoys in him the "infinite cause of all things."[5]

God then shines into the spiritual man as into a "Christall," and in his light man sees the fulness of light and depth of wisdom.[6] Then man's knowledge ascends to "perfection," to the "highest degree of knowledge," and he beholds "wisdom in the root; the Glory and Fabrick of the Creature shall be seen in the Original, even the Creator," and in the vision of God "shall we read the Resolution of all profitable unknown truths."[7]

Let us turn, then, to the vision of God or act of contemplation as it is experienced in this life. For, unless one can have some glimpse of divine being in this life and feel certain of the union between himself and the divine, that man is not a mystic.

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 163-164.

[2] Ibid., p. 165.

[3] Ibid., p. 51.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 33.

[5] Ibid., pp. 577-578.

[6] Ibid., p. 90.

[7] Ibid.

In at least three different places Rous gives a full and beautiful description of the vision of God in this life.

> Let her [the soul] often goe out of the body, yea out of the world by heavenly contemplations; and treading on the top of the earth with the bottome of her feet, stretch her selfe up, to looke over the world, into that upper world, where her treasure, her joy, her beloved, dwelleth. Let her stand in this watch-tower, and looke out for her lover, as the watch-man lookes out for the morning; and the day-spring from on high shall visit her. Turn thy face away from the enchantments of this world, from dreames of earthly profit and preferment, and turne thy face to the wildernesse, even turne this world into a wildernesse, and as nothing before thy face; and the spirit of God shall come upon thee, and thou shalt see the vision of the Almighty. . . . And thus beholding Christ Jesus with open face, thou shalt see, and feele things inutterable, thou shalt also bee changed from beauty to beauty, from glory to glory by the spirit of this Lord.[1]

> If thou keep this image cleare, that God may see his face in it, he will therein also see his covenant, and seeing his covenant, hee will take thee for his friend, yea for his spouse; and by all these, as by so many cords of love, hee will be drawne to teach thee. Being thus pure in heart thou shalt see God: thou shalt see him here guiding and teaching thee,[2] and hereafter in presentiall vision eternally blessing thee.
>
> And being thus pure in heart, thou shalt see God in thy soule. Hee who is light shall shine into thy soule, and by this light the face of thy soule shall shine, as the face of Moses on the mount. In his light thou shalt see light, and by this light shalt thou see that which all the naturall light in the world cannot show in thee.[3]

> If wine be pleasant to the eye, the sights of the spirit are far more excellent; for they are such as eye hath not seen. The Spirit of God reveals sights unutterable, and our souls annointed with that eye salve, look into Heaven and see him that is invisible. Glorious and delectable are the Contemplations of the Saints, even such, that they grow rapt by the sights which they behold, and are loth to come down from that high Tabor of Vision, into the low and base valley of outward and gross conversation.[4]

The question now arises what does man see in his earthly vision of God? Does he see the essence of God himself? Dom Butler feels Augustine believed it possible for a few select, blessed individuals to have a momentary glimpse of the essence of God. Moses was such a one.[1] The language used by Rous is primarily devotional, so he never really comes to grips with this problem; however, enough is said in his various treatises that a few conclusions might be drawn.

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 266-268.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 126-127.

[3] Ibid., pp. 153-154.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 179.

Where Rous speaks of Moses's vision, he writes as if it refers to the things of the next world as the object of sight and to a heightened faith as the means of vision.[2] Francis Rous never fully explained Moses's vision of God as a philosophical problem but merely stated that Moses's "faith [had] truly seen God."[3] He did say in one place that no man could see God and live.[4] Where he does speak of the vision of God he indicates that man sees the glory of God or sees some beams of divine light.[5] Two things are of importance in the vision of God. One, man must be pure in body and soul before he receives the spiritual "eye salve" that enables him to see God. Secondly, Rous never speaks of the essence of God as apart from the nature or attributes of God, but he simply says: "The Spirit of God reveals sights unutterable, and our souls annointed with that eye-salve, looks into heaven and see him that is invisible."[6]

But such statements are always guarded by others holding that "we walk by faith, and not by sight," by the "sight of the soul, and not of the body,"[7] or that we behold the glory and beams of heavenly light only through a "crany" in the flesh,[8] or that in our spiritual marriage we are more carnal than spiritual "so the tabernacle of corruptible flesh doth much cloud and darken the Spirit, in view of incorruptible joyes."[1] Rous seldom used the figure of a darkening cloud, and it never found the place in his mysticism that it enjoyed in Gregory or in the Cloud of Unknowing and other numerous western mystics.

---

[1] Butler, op. cit., pp. 78 f.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 508.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid., p. 506. [5] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[6] Ibid., p. 179. [7] Ibid., p. 172. [8] Ibid., p. 35 f.

A fine summary passage, showing both what the believer did see and yet the partial measure of his visions, is found in the following passage:

> By thy inward sight thou shalt in some measure behold God, thy chief Felicity, the love of God in Christ Jesus given for our ransom, the admirable graces and virtues of a holy and sanctifying Spirit. In sum, thou shalt see such divine sights that thou wilt not give thy Contemplations for a Kingdom. For at what price will a heavenly soul sell his Meditations? . . . . .But in the steadfast watch-tower of divine Contemplation; behold sights worthy of a Creature endued with a heavenly soul.[2]

As was just stated, one aspect of contemplation during earthly existence is that the union of God is only partial and through a "crany" opened in the soul. This is a frequently recurring figure used by Rous both in dealing with the vision itself or with the spiritual marriage as the medium of the vision. Following are given quotations from three different treatises that the reader might see what a persuasive and important concept it was for Rous. In the Art of Happiness he says: "For even here have we a crany opened, by which some beams of the divine Glory shine into our hearts, and give us a glimpse of that, whereof hereafter we shall have a full enjoying."[3]

In the same treatise he says a similar thing with regard to the spiritual marriage and repeats the thought both in the Mysticall Marriage and in his earlier Meditations.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 87.

[2] Ibid., p. 179.

[3] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

> For this marriage is between the creature the Creator. And how can the creature comprehend the Creator especially since we have here only a little glimpse of Faith, whereby to behold him? Again it is a Spiritual Marriage, and we are here more carnal than spiritual; so the tabernacle of corruptible flesh, doth much cloud and darken the Spirit, in the view of incorruptible joyes. Yet we are not left here wholly ignorant of that, which here we cannot wholly know; but he who is our Happiness, hath shewed some sparkles of that which he is. . . . .[1]
>
> But the soul beholdeth not an object for her pure joy, for he whom the soul loveth and should onely love, is gone to a far country; yet is her heart towards him, she thinks still upon him though a pilgrim in a strange land: she breaketh out into longing passions, and enquireth of the shepherds for him: she looks by a chink, with the eye of spiritual light into heaven, and so hath a glimpse of him for whom she is sick of love: for he stands behind a wall, this earth of ours is a partition betwixt us and him, and he looks through it but by a little gate. . . . .[2]

> The bridegroome here doth but looke in upon the soule at a crany, and the soule seeth him but by glimpses, but there shall she behold him face to face; and this beholding as it is full, so it shall be perpetuall. The soule is here walled up in a house of clay, and the trafficke between her and her husband is but by some chinke which the spirit hath bored.[3]

Another way of speaking about the incompleteness of earthly contemplations or visitations is to speak of them as merely "pledges" or "earnests" of that which is to come.[4] Usually the term "earnests" is used in conjunction with the conception of the spiritual marriage, but even when speaking of contemplation apart from the marriage "visitation," Rous holds to the transitory nature of the experience. Witness his following statement:

> . . . . . For well doth every Saint of God know that the glory and comfort of contemplation lasts but some turns, and then comes to an ebb of grace, a night of visions and perchance a long storm of Satans buffetings. Either the Spirit withdraws his glorious beams for the soul, or the soul it self is forsaken of the body, as not able to endure a long bent of high Meditations.[5]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 87.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 525.

[3] Rous, _Mysticall Marriage_, pp. 162-163.

[4] _Ibid_., pp. 59, 60, 216-223.

[5] Rous, _Treatises_, p. 148.

But though the experience is not as full or permanent as eternal vision, it is, nevertheless, real.[1] Actual visitations of the soul by Christ the Bridegroom do occur, an actual vision of God by faith is the lot of the mystic believer. Moses certainly saw heavenly things by his faith,[2] and that measure of light which is given to one is sufficient for "discerning so much truth, as may lead him like a streame to the Ocean and fulnesse of truth and blessedness."[3]

The reality of the visitations and the reception of them by the believer are defended by Rous in these words:

> Such visitations there are, for they are seene and felt by men seeing and waking; and seeing and waking not onely with the bodily eyes, but with two better eyes, the one human reason, and the other far excelling that, divine heavenly light, Spirituall light beholds these spirituall gifts, and shewes them to the understanding, which being convinced by that which it sees, believes then it selfe, and would also deliver over the sight, and the beliefe of them to others.[4]

## D. The Mystical Marriage and Spiritual Union

It has been indicated that Rous speaks of the vision of God as seen from the watch-tower of contemplation. That vision is prepared for through the operation of the Spirit aiding man's intellectual and spiritual purification and the subsequent gift of eye salve bestowing a spiritual mind to discern spiritual things. But when Rous wishes to speak about that mystical experience of the soul with God, he turns most frequently to the symbol of the spiritual marriage. The Biblical basis for the doctrine was found in the allegorization of the Song of Solomon.

The conception of spiritual marriage as a means of expressing the relation between God and a soul has a long history. It was present in the Greek mysteries, was used by Philo and other Alexandrian Jews, and was widely used by the Gnostics. The Neoplatonists, following Plotinus, also used the doctrine. Thus it has a twofold source for Christian theology--the Greeks through Neoplatonism and the Jews through Philo. However, it must be said,in the Old Testament the idea was used only for the relation between the community and the Lord. Origen was the first Christian theologian consistently to allegorize the Song of Solomon in the direction of the mystical marriage. The idea was, consequently, widely prevalent among all Greek fathers, and it was also found in Augustine, Tertullian, Ambrose, and Jerome. It was Bernard's series of sermons on the Canticles that firmly implanted this mode of symbolism in the Western Church, and from henceforth it was a favorite symbol with most western mystics.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 225.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 508.

[3] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 113-114.

[4] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 226.

In a recent article, Mr. Melville Channing-Pierce far overestimates the importance of Rous's use of sexual symbolism to express the mystical experience.[2] Restating the old mistaken view that "puritanism is, at root, a reaction from sexual licence," Mr. Channing-Pierce appears somewhat surprised that Francis Rous, a staunch Puritan, used the symbolism of the Song of Songs. Because of that, he felt that "the paradox of its author's personality" was enhanced.

But, it is not at all strange or paradoxical that Rous, a Puritan, used the sexual symbolism of Canticles to articulate his mysticism. The imagery was widely used by many Puritans of his day. It has already been established that the outstanding Puritan leader, Richard Sibbes, drew heavily on Canticles for his sermons to hard-headed Puritan lawyers in Gray's Inn.[1] No less a staunch Puritan than the Presbyterian Samuel Rutherford used the same symbolism. In many of his letters the language approaches the fervency and frankness of Rous, but he too maintained a dignity and purity which enhanced his zealous yearnings for Christ.[2] This mode of symbolism offered the fervent glowing hearts of Puritan leaders the most significant, practical way of verbally expressing an essentially incommunicable experience. Besides, it was Biblical language.

---

[1] Inge, op. cit., pp. 367-372; Nygren, op. cit., II, Part II, 441-446; Underhill, Mysticism, pp. 509 f., 162 f.

[2] Melville Channing-Pierce, "Francis Rous: Mystic and Man of Affairs," Congregational Quarterly, XXV (April, 1927), p. 124.

The surprise of Mr. Channing-Pierce rests on an assumption concerning Puritanism as a theological and intellectual movement. It is unnecessary to show at length that such a generalization about British Puritanism is basically unsound. Any number of thorough scholars in recent years satisfactorily explicated the Puritan temper, theology, piety, and life entirely apart from such a morbid explanation.[3] That it reacted against sexual licence is no more than to say that it reacted against any and all licence which detracted from the main business of life--communion with God.

On the other hand, there is no indication in Rous's theological writings that he, personally, was "in reaction" to sexual licence in itself. As a good Puritan he objected to overstressing anything in existence that might detract from one's seeking for and communion with the supreme good. He conceived of religion not as a reaction from anything but rather as something of great joy and gladness.[1] Reaction from sex or repression of sex which leads to sublination or unconscious projection, is not the key to his thought. Religion is joy from the "oyl of gladness" bestowed by the Spirit, but it is of such great weight that man struggles to express its depth and intensity.

---

[1] See above, I,

[2] Samuel Rutherford, Letters of Samuel Rutherford, ed. by A. A. Bonar (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1891), passim. See especially letter cxx.

[3] Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, pp. 338-480; Knappen, Two Puritan Diaries, passim; William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), pp. 120 f.; Herbert Schneider, The Puritan Mind (New York; Henry Holt, 1930); Perry, op. cit., pp. 36-115, 219-392; Miller, The New England Mind, pp. 59 ff.; Roland H. Bainton, "Marriage and Love in Christian History," Religion in Life, XVII (Summer, 1948), 391-403.

There is no evidence that Rous led a thwarted or suppressed life either at home or in his political activities. There is but scant material available in the United States with regard to his personal life, but on the basis of various short biographical accounts, one assumes that he had a happy home life with his wife and son.[2] Completely immersed in the pulsating religious and political controversies of seventeenth century England, he appears to have been a well balanced, fully rounded, extremely busy, but happy personality.

His own reason for using sexual symbolism was expressed in these terms:

> So the joy of love and union in an earthly marriage, cannot expresse a heavenly joy that is spiritually pure, and purely active. Only these and like comparisons may serve for staires, whereby to ascend, even above these comparisons, and to set our foot on something beyond them.[3]

Physical marriage is at best a dark comparison as he points out:

> And though this inchoate marriage here on earth compared to the consunamate marriage in heaven, seeme but like to a betrothing, yet even this betrothing compared to earthly marriages, casts a shadow of darkenes on them: for all the beautie, all the glorie, all the joy in the world are but

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 113, 115, 119, 120, 518, 603, 618.

[2] See above, I, 45

[3] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 52-53.

beames, and rayes, & flashes of this King of glory, beauty & joy.[1]

Another interesting thing about Rous's use of the spiritual marriage was his continual double application of idea. Many times he spoke of the marriage as between Christ and the Church.[2] In other places, he spoke of it as between the soul and Christ.[3] It was not merely a matter of his shifting emphasis in later writings for the sake of authority. The two appear simultaneously in his 1635 edition of The Mysticall Marriage. He uses both conceptions in his other treatises as well.

This could be due to one of several things, either alone or in combination. The reluctance to reject the accepted Protestant interpretation of the Church as the bride of Christ, or the necessity of holding both conceptions at once and feeling that the soul as the bride of Christ could be understood only in relation to the larger conception of the Church as the Lord's bride--these might have been the reasons or reason for his double usage. However, it is to be remembered that Bernard, Richard of St. Victor, and most of the great mystics used both conceptions at once. Even if the emphasis fell on the individual soul as the bride of Christ, that did not invalidate or supercede the ancient tradition of Christ as the Bridegroom of the Church. It is difficult to find a Christian mystic who did not hold to both conceptions in concert, so it is not unusual to find Rous among their number.

In numerous passages previously cited, the idea of the spiritual marriage was predominantly present; however at this point the object is to indicate a little more clearly what kind of experience Rous was trying to articulate and the fervent yet highly spiritualized language he employed.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

[2] Ibid., pp. 171, 172; Rous, Treatises, pp. 180 f.; Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 120 f.

[3] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, passim; Rous, Treatises, pp. 42 f., 525; Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 26 f.

1) Intensely spiritual conception of the marriage.-- Two things are at once apparent in Rous's treatment of the spiritual marriage. One is the operation of the Holy Spirit in providing the means and place of union, and the other is the type of union which occurs. As was stated in the third chapter of this thesis, the Holy Spirit as effector and sanctifier is the key to Rous's mysticism. It is the Spirit who personally effects God's saving grace in those whom God has chosen. That results in faith, repentance, conversion, and regeneration. The high point of the process is the believer's union with Christ through the spiritual marriage, the new covenant, or as part of the seed of the woman. But this is only the beginning of a new life, for man's new duty is to retain and increase the Spirit through a process that can be termed a growing purgation. The end product of man's persistent striving in the Spirit is a continued and expanded illumination which leads to a fuller vision of God or to more frequent visitations by the heavenly Bridegroom with all their attendant blessings.

At the very opening of The Mysticall Marriage Rous states the importance of the Holy Spirit in the mystical process. It is the Spirit who prepares within man a "Sanctuary" into which the soul flys for rest, safety, and comfort.[1] Men are then made the temples of the Holy Ghost. This sanctuary is also described in these words: "There is a chamber within us, and a bed of love in that chamber, wherein Christ meets and rests with the soule; and the force of friends, or men either dares not or cannot breake in, to disturbe the rest of Christ with the soule, nor of the soule with Christ."[1] That is the center of man wherein the mystical visitations occur.

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, preface.

The other important fact concerning the spiritual marriage is that man's union with God is not immediate but mediated. This is clearly indicated when Rous deals with the problem of man's impurity and consequent uncertainty of the eternal God dwelling with sinful man:

> As for thy impurity, true it is that thou art indeed too uncleane to touch God in an immediate unity; but there is a pure counterpart of thy nature, and that pure humanity is immediately knit to the purest Diety. And by that immediate union, thou maist come to a mediate union. For the Deity, and that humanity being united, make one Saviour, Head, and Husband of soules; and thou being married to him who is God, in him art also one with God. He one by a personall union, thou one by a mysticall.[2]

Three things are of interest in that statement. First is that man's impurity, due to sin and gross corruption, is a barrier between God and man dwelling in unity. That is due not only to the fact of sin as moral perversion but also to the fact that the soul of man is subject to the grossness and impurity of bodily life.[3] In such a state man cannot have union with God unless God comes to man. Thus the incarnation is seen in the old Greek terms as expressed by Athanasius that God became man that man might be deified.[4] This opens the way for a doctrine of deification. And, finally, man's union with God is only through the union of the God-in-man of Jesus Christ. In him pure humanity was immediately knit to the purest Deity in an hypostatical, personal union, so that man purified by the operation of the Spirit might have a mediated, mystical union.

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., pp. 8-9. [3] Ibid., p. 3.

[4] Athanasius, "The Incarnation of the Word," Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, ed. Philip Schaff and H. Wace (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1892), IV, 65.

Such a conception guards against pantheism on the one hand and an overworked sexual symbolism on the other hand. Though Rous never makes explicit, as does Bernard,[1] that Christ as the Word is the Bridegroom of the soul, he does emphasize that the union is between the Spirit of Christ and the spirit of man and is possible only because the Saviour possesses the Spirit in the highest measure. Both of these conceptions are expressed when he speaks of the spiritual marriage as: "A right kindly and blessed marriage, wherein a spirit marries with a spirit, a derived spirit with the originall and roote of spirits: yea with a spirit that hath abundance of spirit, and so can continually refresh and nourish her with a new supply of spirit."[2]

Again, he guards against any physical interpretation of the spiritual marriage in the following way: "And because the union of our spirits with this Spirit is onely in Christ, with whom the soule becoming one spirit hath union with the highest spirit, therefore the soul having found Christ, rejoyceth in him above all things, with a joy unspeakable and glorious."[3] The marriage or union that occurs is a spiritual conjoining in which the Spirit of Christ combines with the spirit of man in a blessed communion. The language leads one to think of it principally as a union of will and affections. It is to be recalled that it was previously indicated that the will and affections were the bottom of the soul where the Lord pressed home to rest; hence the necessity of total surrender and purification of the will and affections.[1]

---

[1] Butler, op. cit., pp. 140 ff.

[2] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 42.

[3] Ibid., pp. 248-249.

Rous uses similar language concerning the marriage of spirits at the conclusion of a passage which contains the most fervent erotic language of any of his treatises. Nevertheless it must be emphasized that the passage opens and closes with terminology which leaves no doubt as to his intentions in the use of such language. His fervent, emotional heart is attempting to express the intensity of his religious experience, and marriage symbolism appears to offer the best comparative means to carry the believer up to a spiritual experience which overwhelms one in its magnificence and magnitude. In reading this passage one is struck with the same balance between purity and passion as is encountered in such recognized mystics as Bernard, Ruysbroeck, St. Teresa, and St. John.

> And being thus united and married to him, his spirit flowes into thy spirit, and the sappe of the Deity sheds it selfe into they soule. For as man and wife in a corporall marriage, are one flesh, so in this spirituall and mysticall marriage, Christ and his spouse are one spirit. The spirit of Christ entring into our spirits, layes in them an immortal seed, and from thenceforth those whom he found impure, he makes pure; even pure in heart, so that they may see God. . . . . By his precious blood he purgeth her from her guilt, & by his spirit he purfieth her from her incleanesse; and both of these he bestoweth on her in his marriage with her. And then the soule thus washed, hath boldness to approach unto God, through her husband, the Son of God, who hath loved her, and given himself unto her. For God beholds her, and she beholds God, as one with his Sonne, even as his Sonnes wife. Then draw neare O soule, to this husband of soules, the Lord is the spirit that marrieth spirits, & makes them one spirit with him in a knot of eternall blessedness. Cleare up thine eye, and fixe it on him and on the fairest of men, the perfection of spiritual beautie, the treasure of heavenly joy, the true object of most fervent love, and inflamed affections: and accordingly fasten on him, not thine eye only, but thy mightiest love & hottest affections. Looke on him so, that thou maist lust after him, for here it is a sinne, not to looke that thou maist lust, and not to lust having looked. For the spirit hath his lust also; it lusteth against things contrary

---

[1] See above, pp. 136, 137.

> to it, and it lusteth for things con-natural to it. Accordingly it lusteth against the flesh; but it lusteth after spiritual objects; whereof Christ Jesus is the chiefest. Let thy spirit then looke and long, and lust for this Lord who is the spirit, the chiefest spirit; let it cleave to him, let it hang about him, and never leave him till hee be brought into the chambers of thy soule. . . . .To this end bee still gazing on him, and still calling on him: *Kisse me with the kisses of thy mouth*; Yea kisses my soule with such a kisse of thy spirit, that they may be no longer two, but one spirit: say to him, whom have I in heaven but thee, and whom have I desired on earth beside thee? My soule thirsteth, and panteth for thee the living God. Tel him that thou art sicke of love. . . . . And if he see thee all on flame with love, and obstinate in Importunity by love, he who is love, cannot deny the importunitie of love. . . . .And now when his love meeteth with thine, his love joyneth with thine; when his spirit meeteth with thine, his spirit powreth it selfe out into thine; hee is joyned to thee, thou art one spirit with him, his spirit and thine being united and mingled in a blessed communion.[1]

In this passage the spiritual significance of the marriage is clearly indicated. The spirit of man and the Spirit of Christ became one spirit as the "sappe of Diety" is shed into the soul. An "immortal seed" is laid in man's soul, the same as that described in regeneration.[2] It is at this point that the conjunction between regeneration and the mystical marriage can be noted and, thus, the extreme importance of the operation of the Holy Spirit. As was indicated in the last chapter the process of regeneration has all the aspects of a mystical experience both as to what takes place within the soul of man, and also as to its effects on the mind and heart of man. In this chapter our interest is in the continuation of the experience through frequent visitations of the heavenly Bridegroom as he sheds his Spirit into the spirit of man and conforms their wills and affections in a communion that eventuates in tremendous ethical activity as well as in a vision of God with all of its attendant gifts.

---

[1] Rous, *Mysticall Marriage*, pp. 9-17. Cf., *ibid*., pp. 212-213.

[2] Rous, *Treatises*, pp. 31, 35, 60, 510, 525. Also see above Chap. IV, 140 f.

2) Transitoriness of the visitations.-- The spiritual marriage, just as contemplation, has periods of fruitfulness and periods of dearth. The Bridegroom does not dwell perpetually with the soul even though the marriage between them is a permanent union. There is a "dark night" of the soul which is not a stage in prepararation but an actual cessation of heavenly visitations.[1] The husband is at times in a far country, and the soul who has left all for Christ seems to be left by him in a "cloud of desertion."[2] But the soul should really be of good comfort for she is forsaken only for a "small moment."[3] In spite of all appearances to the contrary the union with Christ remains firm even though he has drawn in his breath and has left.[4] The fact is that these desertions are of great value, because the God of love said that all things "shall turne to good to them that love him."[5] Rous enumerates at least five reasons for the transitory nature of the Bridegroom's visitations.

a) It keeps man humble. The soul given deep secrets and great joy though heavenly visitations often succombs to the flesh and takes pride in them. She turns her attention from her husband to his riches and becomes a spiritual harlot.[6] Humility is the only bed in which the Husband will lie down and rest with the soul, so desertions help bring humility which again brings Christ.[7] Thus the soul should realize that the withdrawal of her Husband prevents too much "fatness" and keeps the soul in proper condition of humility.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 181.

[2] Ibid., pp. 98-108. [3] Ibid., p. 105.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 535.

[5] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 106.

[6] Ibid., pp. 127-131.

[7] Ibid., pp. 133-135, 139-143; Rous, Treatises, p. 535.

b) The soul learns by miseries to amend all faults that prevent Christ's coming. It is quite possible that man has offended his Saviour either through neglect or through some contrary action. If the soul has grieved the spirit of her beloved she will soon learn what the grief of his absence is and will then grieve him no more.[2] The soul will proceed to make a more narrow search of her faults that she might be made ready for his coming.[3] Then when the Husband returns she will "binde him with cords of love," "clasp [her] affections about him," and "kisse him much" that he will not soon leave.[4]

c) Christ gives one only as much joy and power as one is able to bear. The soul must be fruitfull in a few visitations before she is trusted with larger or fuller joys.[5] Usually those having the greatest troubles in life have the greatest consolations in visitations, so a balance is kept. Let not one man envy another, but let each man rejoice in that which God has pleased to give him.[6] God knows the ability and measure of all.

d) It teaches patience. At all times and in all estates the soul must fully trust and wait upon her Lord. The "dark night of desertion" teaches submission to Christ's will. He is a "free agent" and his Spirit "bloweth when, as well as where hee listeth."[7] There are times and tides of the Spirit, so the eyes of the Spouse must constantly wait in patience until he will regard her.[8] A soul must wait in a patient submissiveness that God's will be done. But such patience is not idleness.[1] The soul should rather be busy doing that which will procure the Bridegroom's coming.[2]

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 300-301.

[2] Ibid., pp. 122-125.

[3] Ibid., pp. 306-307.

[4] Ibid., pp. 113-115.

[5] Ibid., pp. 311-312.

[6] Ibid., pp. 313-317.

[7] Ibid., p. 151

[8] Ibid., pp. 152-154.

What does this work consist in? Rous says it is primarily "the worke of the ordinary calling, yet maist thou give times and seasons to those workes that more immediately concerne thy heavenly calling, even such as immediately call for thy heavenly Lord to come into thy soule. . . . ."[3] Then Rous proceeds to enumerate such works as comprise the mystical path of purgation as outlined earlier in the chapter. This is but another proof that he was a genuine, thorough-going mystic. During periods of the Bridegroom's absence, the soul was to engage in sighs of longing and fervent prayer, reading and hearing the Word, heavenly meditations, and a thorough examination with necessary steps to make sure that the soul was trimmed as a bride looking for her husband.[4]

The pattern of preparation was shown to be a mixture of man's "earthly labours" and "heavenly thoughts" in which one would "worke and sigh, worke and wish, worke pray, in short ejaculations: and thus working, thus waiting, working in profitable duties, and waiting with submissive patience, he that loveth both thy workes and thy patience will come unto thee. . . . ."[5]

e) The interrupted visitations draw one's eyes from this stage of joy to the place of "incessant and everlasting joyes". It forces the believer to look beyond the present foretastes of joys as only "earnests," "drops, and parcels of infinite fulnesse" to the uninterrupted and perpetual fruition of joy and light."[6]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 155 f.

[2] Ibid., p. 160.

[3] Ibid., pp. 160-161.

[4] Ibid., pp. 161-162.

[5] Ibid., pp. 162-169.

[6] Cf., ibid., 59-60, 220-223.

This guarantees that the believer is not concerned with visitations only for the present benefits, but the joys themselves serve to point to a supernatural or otherworldly goal.

Thus it is most evident that the dark night of desertions was of great value to those souls who were united in the "knot of blessedness" to their Lord and Redeemer.

### E. The Effect of Union and Spiritual Marriage on Man

The most important effect of the spiritual marriage has already been mentioned but will not be dealt with until the next chapter. The idea of the soul bearing spiritual offspring as the fruit of the heavenly visitation occurs but infrequently in mysticism. Dom Cuthbert Butler pointed out that Bernard used the idea,[1] and Evelyn Underhill outlined Richard St. Victor's systematic presentation of it.[2] We have seen that the doctrine held an important place in the mysticism of Francis Rous,[3] but it has been thought best to treat it in the following chapter as it forms the basis of his ethical activity or life in the Spirit. This section will be confined to those other effects on man caused by the operation of the Spirit in the visitations of the Bridegroom.

1) Joy and gladness.-- One of the figures that Rous often employed to express the reality of spiritual joy was that of wine. The figure occurs in all his major treatises as the new wine of the kingdom or the wine of the Spirit as opposed to carnal or earthly wine. The following two selections show his peculiar use of the symbol to express the joy that results in spiritual marriage:

> In the bodily wine it is the spirit of the wine, that re-

---

[1] Butler, op. cit., pp. 165 ff.

[2] Underhill, Mysticism, p. 166.

[3] See above, pp. 131-132.

> joyceth the spirits of the body. But a wine that is all spirit, spirit in the height and top of spirituallnesse, and newly drawne and sucked from the prime and chiefest spirits, how doth that ravish the spirits that drink it? when mans highest part doth taste the highest good.[1]
>
> Yet this is not all of that, which cannot be expressed: For the whiles there flows from the Deity, unto the Heart of Man, a most pleasant stream of the gladding Spirit, wherein is the extremest power and verture of rejoycing. Thus is the new Wine of the Kingdom of Heaven, which makes the Soul drunken with high comforts; raptures, and extasies: which inward comforts meeting and clasping with outward joys, fil up a man with an excess of Joy and Happiness, that he shall be even swallowed up, and over-ravished with joy.[2]

Again, he expressed this joy as "nutrimentall to the very soule spirit of man"[3] for "then as shee hath heard, so shee hath seene and tasted that an heavenly joy is to the soule a restaurative medicine: and that when shee enjoyeth her Sauiour in the contemplations and tastes of his love, then is she filled with marrow and fatness."[4] This is a "supernaturall " joy both in its root and the object it fixed on.[5] There are numerous places where Rous speaks of the new joy and gladness shed into man's heart by the visitation of the Bridegroom.[6] The full significance of the coming of the Spirit bringing Christ Jesus was summarized as:

> Surely, it is the sap of the Tree of Life, a juyce of Eternity, a food of Life everlasting. When his Spirit cometh into us, it is a Light to our darkness, a Purifier of our pollution, a conveyance of our Redemption, a celestial Fire to warm the benummed coldness of our spiritual blood, a seed of living and perpetual felicity. It offers to guide us, it offers to sanctifie us, it offers us justification, it offers us zeal, it offers us eternal Glory.[7]

2) Time of power.-- When the Spirit comes in heavenly vis-

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 49.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 91.

[3] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 251.

[4] Ibid., p. 254. [5] Ibid., p. 242.

[6] Ibid., pp. 242, 248, 252-253, 308; Rous, Treatises, pp. 180, 535.

[7] Ibid., p. 60.

itations one of the effects upon man is an increase of prayer and power. When the Spirit stirs the waters, then it is time to pray for mighty powers and ask for great things.[1] This Spirit is a spirit of power, so when it comes strongly upon one, he should attempt great works.[2] The Soul existing in flesh and blood is as a ship aground, but the tide of the Spirit sets her afloat, so:

> As the Seaman watcheth the naturall winde and tide, so doe thou watch the winde and tide of the spirit. The Spirit bloweth when he listeeth, and when he listeeth to blow, then set forth on some noble action: when the tide of the spirit bloweth, then put thy hand to the oare, for then if thou rowe strongly, thou maist advance mightly.[3]

This time of power and joy also enables one to bear the cross and to profit in suffering as well as in works of love. All this gives the believer strength and confidence: "Thus in laying up the scales of union, thou layest up a stocke of confidence, and thou maist see Saint Paul making the same provision, the same use of it: God hath given us the earnest of the spirit, therefore are wee always confident."[4]

6) Music.-- There are several places in which Rous speaks of the gifts of visitation as music by which the believer is drawn on to heavenly felicity. First, he says: "The joyfull sound, and the light of Gods countenance doe not allow any to take up their rest here, but they call on them to walke cheerfully in good duties, by these streams of blessednesse, unto the ocean and fulness of blessednesse."[5] And then he again states: "And as with the sound of outward musicke the spirit of God came upon the Prophet: so with the sound of this inward musicke (be it in holy contemplations, ardencies, desires in vocations, resolutions) the

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 184.

[2] Ibid., p. 192. [3] Ibid., p. 193.

[4] Ibid., pp. 206-207. [5] Ibid., pp. 201-202.

Spirit of Christ Jesus commeth more powerfully and plentifully into the soule."[1] Richard Rolle,medieval English mystic, used the symbol of inward music quite frequently and far more effectively than Rous.[2]

4) Light.-- This is one of the most widely used terms in Rous's treatises to describe the effect of the mystical marriage on the soul. The soul soon finds that this light is superior to natural light:

> And indeede reason even with reason gives way, that a greater light should rather guide than a lesser, yea with reason it gives way, that it selfe being a lesser light, should be increased and enlarged by a higher and greater, that so it may discerne higher and greater things. And this increse it experimentally findes: for by this new and greater light, the soule sees the supreme light which begate it, she sees him to be her soveraign good: she sees the way to him and is directed to union with him, and to full fruition of him.[3]

The reasonable light of man continues in man but it yields willingly to the heavenly light.[4] And the result of this gift of light is described as follows:

> And when this light shinneth brightly, then the soul by it doth see spirituall things as truely and assuredly, as the corporall eye doth corporall things. . . . .By this light, things formerly not known are seen & discovered, and spirituall things known before only by a carnall, which is a false knowledge, are spiritually & so truly discerned; for the light is that which maketh manifest, and this light being spirituall maketh spirituall things so manifest, that it gives a full assurance of understanding, and makes us know that we know them.[5]
>
> And hee that hath this light hath the key of knowledge, by which he can open the mysteries of salvation, and discover the counsells of God, and see the mind of Christ, and find out wonders in Gods Law. He pierceth into the inward veine of the word, and (as it were) lets out bloud, and causeth to spring from it, a floud of doctrine: whereas the same word to another that hath not this light, seems like the Rocke

---

[1] Ibid., p. 289.

[2] Knowles, op. cit., pp. 76 f.; cf., Underhill, Mysticism, pp. 92 f.

[3] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 240-241.

[4] Ibid., pp. 239-240. [5] Ibid., pp. 231-232.

whereof it is said; Shall I fetch you water out of this Rocke?[1]

The high point of the inflow of the Spirit bringing light is the visitation by the Husband: "Wherefore let the soule make speciall use of this precious light which shineth within her, in the accesses of her husband, let her marke, and learne, and record the discoveries of that light, for a spirit so enlightened will discoverer more than seven men upon a watch-tower."[2]

When the soule finds this light shed abroad within her, it is time to scrutinize closely all of her interests for then dark things will be made clear. She should look at her true happiness by comparing the Creator and creature, God and the world, or eternity and time. That is the moment to meditate on the prosperity of the wicked, and so-called adversity of the godly. And finally, the time of light is a time to lock on scripture and find therein a "plot of divine wisdom" and mystery of high and supernatural truth.[3] Thus light becomes a means of a fully personal revelation: "For the God who commanded light to shine out of darknesse, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[4] And again: "For both light and love are discoverers of secrets: light makes manifest things hidde in darknes, love tels counsels unto the beloved."[1]

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 60.

[2] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 174. Cf., ibid., pp. 166, 173, 239, 240; also, Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 57-62.

[3] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 178-181.

[4] Ibid., p. 182. Cf., Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 58-59, where Rous uses the same words to describe the gift of light. Just a few lines before that he quotes Pseudo-Dionysius's Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chap. 3, and Richard of St. Victor's Apocolypse, bk. 7, chap. 10, to substantiate the conception of the spiritual and divine light given to believers in more than an ordinary measure. Cf., Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 154.

An excellent passage serving as a summary of that which the soul receives in light and also as an introduction to the next effect of heavenly visitation is where Rous says: "Yea certainly, in the bed of love he will not tell her the words of his counsells; but by a sacred unction (being one spirit with her) hee will make her to see the counsells of his words: hee will give her an inward and spirituall eye, to see the inward riches and realities of his counsells."[2]

5) Spiritual knowledge and sight.-- This result of the heavenly visitation is of particular importance because it is the means whereby one is enabled to see spiritual truths and the vision of God. Of utmost necessity is the possession of a spiritual mind. Much of the Heavenly Academie is devoted to that contention. There is a distinction between men of grace and men born only of nature.[3] The latter know not what they cannot see and experience, but as for men of grace, "the heavenly Teacher teacheth them both what and how to believe, he gives them his heavenly truths contained in his Word; and gives them withall an heavenly mind to discerne, believe, and receive them."[4] Thus Christians are better than all other men in that they possess teaching from the infallible teacher.[5] Rous indicates that in saying:

> But the Christian hath a spirit from God in Christ Jesus (for if nay man have not the spirit of Christ, he is not Christs) and this Spirit gives him a spiritual eye, which an Heathen hath not; and yet this eye alone, can truly and kindly see spiritual truths. And for this spirituall eye, which the Christian hath from the Spirit of God, the Heathens and Mahometans may say among themselves. . . . .Can we find such a

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 183.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 123.

[3] Ibid., preface. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

man as this? A man in whom is the Spirit of God?[1]

The necessity for the "spirituall eye" or "heavenly understanding" is because any faculty must be propartionable to the object to be perceived. In good Platonic fashion Rous states that objects of sense are preceived by the senses:

> And for things of second intention, to discern them, we ascend above Sense into Reason, and see them with our Understandings. And now propartionatly if we ascend higher to divine, heavenly, and spiritual mysteries, wee must have a divine, spirituall, and heavenly knowledge, whereby to discern them. For the naturall understanding doth perceive them no better than the ears doth the reason of sounds, or the nose the reson of smells, and summarily, than the senses do the things of the second intention.[2]

In support of this conception, Rous quoted Pseudo-Dionysius on the Divine Names, Thomas Aquinas on Dionysius, and Savonarola.[3] There must be a mind given from God to discern the things of God. The difference between natural and divine truth is not only one of "quantitie, but also a difference of quality."[4] Since the fall, human wisdom and understanding is of an opposite nature and temper from divine wisdom. So, God seeing the need of man gives "a new and heavenly understanding to discerne," which can be described as the mind of Christ that is bestowed in regeneration and comes ever more fully in times of visitation.[5]

The result is fully explicated in the following passage:

> When the soule is inwardly bedewed, and (as it were) written upon by the Spirit, there will arise from this writing, and the vertue of this heavenly dew, an unknowne kind of knowledge, which cannot be taught by man; yea the man himself that knows it cannot teach it to himself before he knows it;

---

[1] Ibid. Cf., Rous, Treatises, pp. 112, 172, 175, 196, 605.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 15-17.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid., pp. 18-19.

[5] Ibid., pp. 19-20. Here Rous quotes Clement of Alexandria as the authority for the conception of heavenly discerning. He cited Clement's Stromateis, bk. 2; bk. 5, Chap. 17.

> but rather knows it first without himself, and then teacheth it to himselfe by this knowing it. The soule being steeped and affected by the Spirit, this affection doth erect, deliver, and speake to the soul hidden truths, which before shee saw not, nor could see by the meere magisterie of man without, no not of her owne man within.[1]

The "hidden truths" that the soul formerly did not know might be "a new discoverie of truths not known before; yea, perchance contrarie to that which before was thought to bee knowne and accordingly beleeved."[2] These "oraculous decisions and Resolutions" might "adde to the stocke of knowledge in the lower schooles who cannot give this knowledge, but may receive it form the higher."[3] The revelational character of this new sight and new knowledge is elsewhere described as follows:

> Yea, sometimes in a minute thou shalt see that by this teaching which thou canst not attaine in many years by humane teaching, or thy owne study, labour, and industrie. Therefore whatsoever time thou bestowest in study, be sure to set apart some time, wherein to study the Holy Ghost, who sitting in his chaire of grace, teaches his Schollers inwardly to see those divine and heavenly truths.[4]

That the gift of spiritual discerning and heavenly wisdom is not just a phenomenon of regeneration but occurs more fully in the spiritual marriage is indicated where Rous says: "And being thus lovely the bridegroom kisseth and embraceth her with spirituall visitations, he tells her his counsales, and his eyes are ever toward her. . . . ."[5] And again he says: ". . . .thus love from love drawes a partaking of secrets: when the heart and ways of men are agreeable to Gods heart, then the heart of God is (as it were) great with that affection that longs to communicate."[1]

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 42-44. In support of this idea, Rous cites Bernard from Canticles, Sermon 85, and from de Naturae et Dign. Amor Divin., chap. 8; and he cites Luther from de Serv. Abit., cap. 53.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 47.

[3] Ibid., p. 49.

[4] Ibid., pp. 155-156. Cf., Rous, Treatises, pp. 197, 499.

[5] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 58.

A similar connection with the spiritual marriage is exhibited by his reference to the soul of the saint as a "little Sanctuary" for therein does Christ rest by his Spirit. The passage is as follows:

> The soule of a Saint is a little Sanctuary, or Temple, where God dwells by his Spirit; and this Spirit being sought to in this Temple by the Servants of God, hath given them many times divine answers and resolutions. So hath this little Temple been turned into a Schoole, where the soules of men enlightened have seen more than seven men upon the Watch-Tower of human speculation.[2]

6) Taste giving experimental knowledge and sweetness.--In numerous places Rous spoke of the taste of divine things which accompanied the operation of Christ's Spirit in the mystical marriage. After tasting the things of which she is possessed, the soul arrives at an "experimentall knowledge" of the things she tasted. Rous here uses the illustration of the "West Indies Piney" to demonstrate this truth. Telling about it is not sufficient, but only tasting can give a true knowledge of the "Piney."[3]

So thoroughly did Rous carry out the conception of taste both as a necessity for heavenly knowledge and as a gift from heaven, that he applied it even to his Biblical hermeneutics. Scripture speaks of Christ's love as more pleasant than wine and the laws of God being sweeter than honey. By these words one does not learn the "true shape" of Christ's love or God's law. Scripture uses them that we may ascend above them to the heavenly things themselves and by trusting learn to know them.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 115. Rous indicates Richard of St. Victor in Canticles, chap. 7, as the source of this idea.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 151, 154. Cf., Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 175-176.

[3] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 31-34. No eloquence can teach this knowledge, says Rous, and quotes in support Basil from Ps. 33; Cyprian from Ep. 1; Gerson in de medit. cordis, chap. 4; and Thomas a Kempis, Ep. 1.

The mere sight of heavenly manna does not give a true knowledge of the real or invisible manna because that can be gained only by tasting.[2] Rous says: "There is a taste in the grace and love of God, which no man can see but by tasting, and by tasting it may be seen."[3] The true knowledge of the love and peace of God cannot be delivered in picture or representation by the greatest doctor on earth. He can only make comparisons, but the believer must taste to know.[4]

The following two passages indicate the connection of the mystical marriage with the gift of taste.

> Thus the soule being united to him, is united to an eternall roote and fountaine of blessednesse: she is lightened with the primitive light, she enjoyeth the primitive beauty, she is adorned with the primitive glory, shee tasteth the radicall, utmost, and uppermost sweetnesse. Being made one with him who is God, she hath the taste of God? and God being tasted, overfloweth, and steepeth, and drencheth the soule with overcoming and inebriating sweetnesse.[5]
>
> But when all is said of this marriage happiness, one taste of it will tell thee more, than al that is or can be said. The true knowledge of the sweetness of God is gotten by tasting, and therefore taste first, and then see how sweet and gracious the Lord is. . . .but he that knoweth this sweetness by tasting cannot deliver over the full and perfect image of this sweetness to him that hathnot tasted it.
>
> . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
>
> Therefore when shee hath gone as farre as she may in the sweetnesse of the creature, let her advance one step more into that spirituall union, wherein is to be tasted, and seene by tasting, the sweetness of the Creator; and then shall shee see more by tasting, than all the creatures could shew her resembling: she hath met with that joy which onely can truely teach it selfe and therefore it is called unspeakable. And

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 33.

[2] Ibid., pp. 36-37. Here Rous again cites Pseudo-Dionysius's Ecc. Hierarchy, chap. 3, on the conception of knowing and tasting.

[3] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 37-38.

[4] Ibid., pp. 38-39. Gerson's de Theologica Mystica was cited as proof of the inability of earthly doctors.

[5] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 46-47.

> whereas before it was tasted the being of it was doubted, and much more the manner and shape of it was unknowne, now it is both knowne to bee, and the shape and manner of it is also known.[1]

One of the most striking things about the spiritual test of divine things is its certainty of the experience. It is a culminating experience described as an endless circle of tasting, loving, and knowing which grows greater as one rounds the circle.[2] Rous was indebted to Pseudo-Dionysius's On the Divine Names for the idea of the endless circle, and he cited him as the source.

The object of the taste was not the sweetness or the emotional experience involved, but it was provided that man might thereby be encouraged to eat for strength that he might accomplish great services of love as he grows in the likeness of the divine image.[3] Again the practical direction and common sense of Rous's mystical piety is apparent. He says: "The sweetness which thou tastest, must needs love the Law, for they are twinnes; this sweetness being shed into our soules, and the law written in our hearts by one and the same spirit."[4]

Here was no leaning towards antinomianism. The law might be written into the heart of man so it was essentially spiritual, the sweetness of Christ's presence and doctrines might be discerned only by a spiritual means,but none of this transcends or contradicts the external law which the Spirit authored. The important thing is a shift in emphasis whereby the law is kept through the freedom of the spirit from the bottom of the heart rather than as an external moral code imposing and compelling its legalistic demands.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 51-55.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 40-41.

[3] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 291-296.

[4] Ibid., pp. 297-298.

There is one interesting passage which states that the soul does not taste comfort in the union but the Comforter himself. Rous says: "In this the Spirit gives not some gross and bodily relish, thereby to become comfortable to the bodily part of Man; but in this the Spirit communicates the sap, taste and relish of its own primitive sweetness, vigour, cheerfulness, so that we do not so much taste comfort, as the comforter himself."[2] Taken in conjunction with the passage just quoted from The Mysticall Marriage, pages fifty four and five,[3] the total impression left is that taste is a means whereby the believer gains a spiritual apprehension of the reality, shape, and manner of her heavenly sweetness and joys, yes even of the Comforter himself.

7) Holiness and conformity to God.-- In a few simple words Rous indicated this gift where he said: "For when Christ visiteth the soule, as he doth clarifie her with light, and ravish her with joy, so he doth beautifie her with holiness."[4] Then he proceeds to show how this holiness is given to the believer, and his language points to a conception of deification. Care must be taken to define this term.

Dean Inge has pointed out that there are at least two distinct views of deification and at least one intermediary conception.[5] One may be referred to as essentialisation in which deification consists in man realizing that his true nature is divine at its core, he brings it into full fruition through a religious or philosophical process. The other may be referred to as substitution whereby man is looked upon as corrupt and in need of redemption which consists in the bestowal of divine attributes or the substitution of the divine will, spirit, or life for the human.[2] The intermediary conception holds that man experiences a gradual transformation which is a continuing process in this life and not an accomplished fact. The ultimate end of the process is to bring us to that which we are not.[3] None of the three conceptions can be separated from the others in the history of thought. One or more usually occurs with another, though one particular view is usually emphasized.[4]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 19, 35, 46, 47, 51, 53, 56, 68, 69, 114, 159, 179, 307 f., all contain references to taste. The concept also occurs frequently in The Mysticall Marriage and in The Heavenly Academie.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 180.

[3] See above, p. 177.

[4] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 254.

[5] Inge, op. cit., pp. 358 f., Appendix C.

It has already been clearly indicated that salvation for Rous meant the eternal possession of the earnests of the Spirit given in the spiritual marriage or experienced in contemplation. The culminating experience was the vision of God or of Light. The attendant gifts of this operation of the Spirit were also described as a circle of knowledge, love and tasting which mounted ever higher in continued visitations by the Bridegroom. All of these factors made man more spiritual or more like the "Original of Spirits" so there was a growth in harmony or conformity.

It is at this point that one can say Rous conceived of salvation as a process of deification of the second and third types indicated by Dean Inge. In the section on anthropology in the second chapter it was stated that man was a spirit, divine and heavenly in origin. But Rous did not make this the basis for an es-

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 259 ff. [2] Ibid., pp. 364 f.

[3] Ibid., p. 365 f.

[4] Harnack, op. cit., III, 163 f., 288 ff. In this still indispensable history of dogma is portrayed the historical growth of the conception as it was developed by the early Church fathers.

sentialisation concept of deification. Rather, he emphasized the fall, the consequent extreme corruption of man, and the absolute necessity of effectual grace. While holding firmly to the Greek conception that like draws like, he contended for the necessity of a spiritual rebirth that man might truly recognize his highest self as spiritual and so seek his true end of felicity in the highest Spirit. Once committed to the rule of the Spirit and married to Christ in a spiritual marriage, the soul undergoes a process of transformation whereby she is made more like her Beloved and so is loved more by him.

There is no thought of deification wherein the believer is absorbed into God and lost as a drop in the ocean. For Rous: "The Spirit of the lover passeth into his beloved, and makes her of one heart and will with him, & this conformity of the will with Christ is true holiness."[1] The process of transformation is one whereby the soul is "fed and supplied with a sap of her owne kinde" so she grows in "being" and becomes "more spirituall" and "more full of divine light, beauty, love vertue, power, life, joy, and glorie."[2] This is true because, "the more we cleave into Christ, the more Christ cleaveth into us, the more we comprehend him, the more he doth comprehend us by a larger and fuller possession of us."[3] In this fuller possession of Christ Jesus the soul is adorned with the most excellent beauty "even the likewise and image of God himselfe."[4]

Any hesitancy about ascribing a conception of deification to Rous is dispelled when one reads:

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 256-257.

[2] Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[3] Rous, Treatises, pp. 52, 114. Cf., Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 159 f.; Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 268, 269, 323, 328, 345.

[4] Ibid., pp. 57-58.

> In these accesses of Christ there are heights of union, the increases of union bring with them increases of uniformity. The spirit of union is fire, fire turnes that into it selfe to which it is united: and the fuller and the closer this union is, the more is this turning. So Christ Jesus the more he comes into a soule by his spirit, the more spirituall doth he make her; yea the more doth he melt a soule into himselfe; the more doth he turne her will into his will, and the more doth hee increase his own image in her; we know that his image is righteousness and true holiness.[1]

The defining of God's image as righteousness and holiness and the ascription of it to the soul through the spirit of Christ actually pouring it into the spirit of man in ever greater measure is a conception of deification.[2] Men advance to an actual possession of godliness and holiness when "they who receive the true oyntments of the Spirit in true visitations. . . .passe beyond a speculative and discoursing holiness even beyond a forme of godliness, and advance to the power of it, to a fruitful expression of this power."[3] But for Rous deification was a process that did not culminate until one passed into eternal possession and full possession of his gifts. Man remained a saint and sinner, though he was moving ever onward to fulfillment, and it was necessary for him to fight sin that he might become more like his Saviour. Rous exhorts the soul to"touch him hard with thy faith, sucke him strongly with thy love, that more vertue may come out of him to cure that issue of sinne yet abiding in the remnant of the flesh, and to make thee more one uniform with him."[4]

The conception of sucking juice from Christ that one might be more like him is founded on the Johannine symbol of the Vine and branches.[5] It is particularly appropo for a conception of deification as a process of transformation because it embodies the idea of the branch becoming more and more like the vine as the juice flows from the latter to the former. That is exactly how Rous continued the passage quoted above. He said that just as the more a bough sucks from the tree, the closer the union between the two, so, the more the soule draws from Christ the more the union, the more she is like him, the more he will delight to be one with her. And so the soul goes on in an endless circle of happiness and sweet harmony.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 255-256.

[2] Ibid., p. 257.

[3] Ibid., pp. 258-259.

[4] Ibid., pp. 287-288.

[5] Jh. 15: 1-9.

In addition to wine and taste the most frequently used symbol in Rous's theology is that of sucking so the soul might become more like her Beloved. He even referred to prayer as a sucking. Perhaps it was a most happy symbol to use in his conception of salvation and union. Certainly, as he used it, it indicated a concept of deification.[2]

8) Trances and visions.-- On the whole Rous does not seem to give much place to psychophysical phenomena. He often speaks about the joy and ravishings of the Spirit, but he only once indicates that it is so great that it "carries her away into extasie" because the soul is "too narrow and feeble to containe and beare a joy that is too large," so the joy fills the soul to the upmost and then "runnes over."[3] Such an experience, however, does not refer to a mental vision or trance and seems to have had no physical accompaniments.

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 288.

[2] Rous, Treatises, pp. 40, 41, 44, 49, 51 f., 62, 72, 83, 92, 578, 587, 606. The term "suck" occurs in other places in his treatises, but these are the most important apart from several passages in The Mysticall Marriage and a few in The Heavenly Academie.

[3] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 47.

In one place he refers to men that have had such "flashes of happiness" in this life, that they "have been ravished up in heavenly trances far above the world." And what they saw, says Rous, was the vision of God, "that high and purest Light."[1] At no place does he actually define the state of the mind in ecstasy or in "flashes of happiness."

The most peculiar phenomenon in Rous's treatises occurs at the conclusion of the following passage:

> Again, the very substance of the Spirit in us, is a kine of heavenly oyl, which makes glad not so much the face as the very heart of man. It hath in it a taste and rellish of the Diety, and therefore above all other, this is the true oyl of gladness. The heart anointed herewith, as it finds a light to guide it, and a vertue moving it to good, and freeing it from slavery of sin, so also it feeleth in it selfe a blessed Rest, an heavenly Sabbath, a joy glorious and unspeakable, an harmony and peace with God, which passeth understanding. Hence come those vehement pangs and expressions of love joy, uttered by the Spouse of Christ, and penned by the Sons of God, which flesh knoweth not how to understand but by the flesh: but the spiritual Man that discerneth all things, fully discerenth and rellisheth them as spiritual truths.[2]

He says that from the sound of that "harmony and peace" come "dancings and exultations of the sons of God" who dance for joy of heart before God. Flesh and blood see only dancing but hear no music. There seems to be no autobiographical reference or ring to the passage; however it does bring to mind David's dance before the Lord as the Ark was returned in triumph to Jerusalem.

## CONCLUSION

This is hardly the place to draw final conclusions or to offer a total analysis of Francis Rous's mysticism. Such is the case because we have yet to notice one of the most dynamic aspects of his mystical theology--the relation of heavenly visitations to the active Christian life of works in love. That being the impulse which provides mementum for his Puritan ethic, it will receive full treatment in the following chapter.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 35.

[2] Ibid.

Nevertheless, certain conclusions are necessary, and we are now in a position to make a few evaluations. It is quite apparent that Rous was a genuine mystic of no mean ability possessed of the gift of fervent expression articulated in a charming, simple, yet elevated prose. His mystical theology was expressed somewhat hesitatingly in 1616,[1] quite fully by 1619,[2] and reached its peak in the 1630's.[3] But for the fact that he was completely immersed in the political and religious upheavals of the Commonwealth, giving fully of his time and effort in behalf of Parliament and Cromwell, he might well have developed into one of the greatest of all English mystics. As it is he deserves a place as one of the major English mystics, the first genuine English Puritan mystic, and as a most interesting readaptation of Puritan theology drawing deeply from universal Christian mystical literature to bolster and give impetus to a genuine Puritan ethic.

Though he quoted many Christian mystics, Rous stood within the tradition of what Dom Cuthbert Butler calls "western mysticism."[4] This must be understood in a restrictive way because Rous, though spiritually a brother with the mystics he quoted, felt himself opposed to the Roman hierarchy. He shared the common Puritan attitude towards Rome but in a less vindictive way tempered by a spirit of tolerance towards certain movements within Catholicism.

---

[1] Rous, Meditations of Exhortation of Reprofe Indeavoring the edification and reparation of the house of God.

[2] Rous, "The Arte of Happiness," Treatises.

[3] Rous, The Mysticall Marriage, 1635; Rous, The Heavenly Academie, 1638.

[4] Butler, op. cit., pp. 179-192.

Rous certainly stands within the "western" tradition in three respects. He conceived of the highest mystical state not as a divine darkness or total annihilation in which the believer was plunged into the "wild waste" of the Godhead or the "Abyss of Nature" but rather as an experience of light, sweetness, fulness, and enhanced knowledge.

Secondly, though he is a post-scholastic, his mysticism is in a sense pre-scholastic. That is, he had no scientific mystical theology worked out in a systematic way. Even his two most mystical treatises, _The Mysticall Marriage_ and _The Heavenly Academie_, were not schematized or systematized. Philosophizing is at a minimum in so far as its formal problems and methods are concerned. Rous was more emotional and less speculative, more practical and less theoretical, and more exhortative but less systematic.

Finally, though he speaks of being "rapt" into heaven and of divine ecstasy he does not dwell upon them nor consider their effects upon the body. Rather than a series of psyco-physical phenomena Rous emerges with a deeply personal spiritual religion expressed primarily through heightened prayer, meditation, and growth in grace. He seems little concerned with visions, trance, and extraordinary revelations. Only once does he mention the possibility of the Devil misleading man in prayer, otherwise he shows no evidence of an obsessing fear of diabolical illusions.[1] Thus in three important respects he agrees with the foremost exponents of "western" mysticism such as Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard. His difference from them was primarily in his treatment of the active life and its consequent ethic.

Another of his healthy emphasis was the balance he maintained between the inner and outer way. Creation and the creatures were not to be completely ignored as something to be turned from, that the soul might more freely pursue its inner ascent. The world and its creatures contained beams of glory that pointed to the Creator, and man could discover this by his reason and so set upon a genuine search for his true felicity. Thus, though Rous did have a sharp distinction between the natural and supernatural, he never felt that the world was either completely evil or merely an unreality from which one must escape. He never fell prey to acosmism or to a Manichean dualism.

---

[1] Rous, _Mysticall Marriage_, pp. 228-229.

His point of departure was religious and not philosophical in that he never posed for himself the entological problem of being or unity. His first concern was how a sinful soul could find union with a just God; thus he emerged with an ethical dualism while avoiding a Manichean ontological dualism. Rous treated these problems in light of the Augustinian-Calvinistic interpretation of the fall and redemption. Only in that direction can his doctrine of purgation and illumination be interpreted.[1] The reason for introversion and recollection and the necessity for new-making of the old man were not because God was an absolute abstraction who could be reached only through man's progressive renunciation of all external life, but such practices were a necessity because man was a sinner both in spirit and body and could have no union with Christ unless he was freed insofar as was possible, from the state of bondage.

---

[1] Some might question the legitimacy of attributing to Rous a doctrine of purgation and illumination. It was stated earlier in this study that he did not systematically work out the threefold mystical path; however, sufficient evidence has been given in this chapter to prove that Francis Rous had a definite place in his religious experience for purgation, illumination, and union. The writer feels that the outline of this chapter did no violence to the thought of Rous but only outlined in a systematic fashion that which was emphasized in his treatises though it was never presented in quite so methodical a way. In fact, one could argue that Rous had the mystic path in mind when he arranged and published together three separate treatises under the title Interioria regni dei. He placed first, The Heavenly Academie which upheld the superiority of divine or spiritual knowledge, and he urged the abandonment of human knowledge and the purification of the body and soul in order that one might receive heavenly illumination. The Great Oracle was placed in the second position. It exhibited the plot of glory revealed in Scripture and maintained that only those whom the Spirit enlightened could understand or believe God's will and plan of salvation as revealed in Holy Writ. The Mysticall Marriage dealt with the state of union or the spiritual marriage between the soul and Christ. In the marriage state, the soul as the spouse of

That brings us to two final observations. One is the central place given to Christ in Rous's mysticism, and the other is his conception of deification. Man's union with God is a mediated union through Christ who is true God-man. The Holy Spirit effects the union and brings to pass the spiritual marriage. The entire process is dependent upon God's effectual grace and the operation of his Spirit, but once man is within the marriage bond, the soul strives to increase its depth and fruitfulness. Enough has been said concerning Rous's doctrine of deification to show that he is in no danger of pantheism; nevertheless, his conception of salvation is not primarily one of fellowship but one of deification.

---

Christ received heavenly visitations and was ravished with joys and various spiritual and intellectual gifts.

# CHAPTER V

## THE RULE OF THE SPIRIT

One of the most interesting aspects of Francis Rous's mystical theology is its relation to his Puritan ethic. In the preceding chapter great care was taken to provide sufficient quotations within the framework of a mystical theology to prove beyond a doubt that Rous was not a spiritualist but a genuine mystic of no small stature. Never formulating the threefold mystic way in a systematic fashion he, nevertheless, in an indirect way, employed all three disciplines of purgation, illumination, and union in his treatises. They were conceived of as parts of the process of sanctification or life in the Spirit which was punctuated by intermittent visitations from the heavenly Bridegroom and by the vision of God.

In the two chapters preceding the treatment of his mysticism, a thorough investigation of his anthropology and soteriology was made. The aim of that section was to indicate that Rous stood within the Augustinian-Calvinistic tradition and deviated in few respects from contemporary Puritan theology. True, his anthropology was definitely influenced by a Lichtmetaphysik, but only in such a way that he did not repudiate the Christian conception of the fall as primarily a moral failure nor transcend the Puritan conception of God as will as well as light. His emphasis upon the fall and its consequent results affecting the total man by placing him under bondage to lust, his emphasis on the failure of general grace and necessity for effectual grace, his upholding double predestination as the plot of glory, his full treatment of the Holy

Spirit as the effector of salvation--all this is good Puritanism. Also, it happened to be the soil in which his mysticism took root

The aim of this chapter is to show that Francis Rous had a fully developed Puritan ethic that was strengthened, not weakened, by his bridal mysticism. Therein lies the direction of this monograph; Francis Rous was not just a mystic but an English Puritan mystic. He did not represent an attempt to substitute a vague emotional satisfaction or even an intensely fervent subjectivity in place of a deep concern for ethical and moral problems of everyday life. To classify him as an antinomian is to misunderstand his background and to do a grave injustice to his theology and intensely moral life.[1] To say that he was part of a movement that "felt no need of a moral purification with a supernatural end in view" and "was little bound to conventions of men or the moral law of the Bible," is either to place him in the wrong movement or to misunderstand the movement of which he was a part.[2]

It seems that most students are strongly influenced by the prejudiced judgment of Ritschl that wherever "Bernardism" or the mystical interpretation of the Song of Solomon, enters Protestantism a deliberate neglect of worldly duties in favor of contemplation results.[3] Even though Max Weber points out that many English and Dutch theologians, who are beyond suspicion, cite Bernard, he too feels suspicious of those who use the Song of Songs. This is indicated when he speaks of the Puritan use of the Old Testament exhibiting a predilection for unemotional and rational passages while conscientiously suppressing the more emotional sections.[1] He finds the proof for this contention in that the Puritans seldom used the Song of Songs: "It was for the most part simply ignored by the Puritans."[2]

---

[1] Johnson, op. cit., pp. 9 f.

[2] Troeltsch, op. cit., II, 752, 753. This is in no way intended to detract from the many excellent insights Troeltsch offers the student of English Puritanism; however, in all fairness it must be said that he had little knowledge of the sources in that field and was dependent upon men, who, for the most part, scarcely read the so-called Puritan mystics such as Rous, Sterry, Vane and others.

[3] Albrecht Ritschl, Geschichte des Pietismus (Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1880), I, 127 ff. Ritschl states that Rous, himself, did not fall prey to the neglect of worldly duties, but those Dutch mystics influenced by "Bernardism" and by Rous were guilty of such neglect. That being so, it is peculiar that Ernst Troeltsch and Max Weber were not more careful in their treatment of other English Puritan mystics and spiritualists.

As was the case with Ernst Troeltsch, Weber did not have sufficient first hand knowledge of the sources to find that, on the contrary, the Song of Solomon was widely used by many Puritans. Rous was not an exception in this, but as Nuttall points out there was a "constant output of Puritan sermons and commentaries on the Song of Songs" and "the use of erotic terms," to describe the soul's relation to Christ "was not infrequent."[3]

Puritanism was an extremely complex movement whether viewed from its theological or sociological aspects, and before one can properly evaluate its relations to and interrelations with complex social, political, and economic forces of its day it will be necessary to make a more thorough investigation of the sources of Stuart and Commonwealth Puritanism. Especially is this true with regard to the spiritualist and mystical wings of Puritanism which controlled the scene during the Commonwealth era. The substantiation or rejection of the Weber-Troeltsch generalizations concerning the sociological implications of English Puritan theological thought depends in large measure upon a thorough reading of Puritan theological literature including all wings of the movement during its formative days and short period of ascendancy.

---

[1] Max Weber, op. cit., p. 123.

[2] Ibid., p. 238, n. 97.

[3] Nuttall, op. cit., p. 148.

Already one of the most widely read scholars in Tudor Puritan sources, Professor Marshall M. Knappen, has expressed himself as disagreeing with the Weber-Troeltsch generalizations as applicable to Tudor Puritanism.[1] In view of these larger problems a study of a Puritan mystic's ethic becomes doubly interesting. Several questions immediately come to the fore. Was the relation of his mysticism to his ethic different from that propounded by such Roman contemplatives as Augustine, Gregory, or Bernard? Did he have a Puritan ethic, and if so, was it weakened, strengthened, misdirected, or broadened by his mysticism? Were Weber and Troeltsch's generalizations with respect to the ethical and sociological implications of Puritan mystical theology valid? These are the questions that will hold our attention as we review the ethic of one of the most influential Puritan mystics.

The uniqueness of Rous's mysticism rests in his synthesis of the spiritual marriage and ethical activity. Thereby he transcended the possibility of a sterile emotionalism and provided a dynamic for his Puritan ethic. Furthermore, he explicated the synthesis in such a way that the results were of a high ethical standard. It has already been mentioned that Rous spoke of "spiritual children" as the result of the Bridegroom's visitations to the soul.[2] He was most emphatic in rejecting mystical experiences as fruitful only in the emotional realm. The object of the union experience was fruitfulness, and the soul must continually cry unto the Lord for spiritual children: "Give me therefore children by this union with thee even fruites of thy spirit which may resemble thee and be pledges to mee of thy union with mee."[1]

---

[1] Knappen, Two Elizabethan Diaries, pp. 1-16; Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, pp. 348 ff., 401 ff.

[2] See above, IV, 130-131.

Two things are of interest in that passage. The good works or "spiritual children" as proof of Christ's union with the soul will be discussed later. The other, that the "children" might resemble the father, Christ, is of interest because it channels the results of the visitations in an ethical direction. Rous expresses the same idea in another place by saying that the very love of Christ "constrains " to "holiness" because in his visitations the love of Christ is shed into the heart; so, the spirit of love given to man is "a power and holiness of spirit" and "a fulfilling of the law by those that love him."[2]

Because of the union with Christ and the joys of loving him, the believer will desire "to bring forth fruit unto him, and by him, and even fruite that may be like him."[3] Recalling that Rous defined the image of Christ as "righteousness and true holiness" and that the object of visitations was also explained in terms of a deification process whereby one actually grew in that image, it is quite evident that his mysticism was above all productive of high morality.[4] The fruits "like him" must be fruits of "holiness and true righteousness." Later we will indicate exactly what these fruits consist of. Here it is sufficient to point out that they were conceived of as occurring within the bounds of the law.

Rous expressed this in these covenant terms: "Where is likenesse and conformitee to God, there is also a covenant with God: where the Law of God is so written in the heart, that by this writing the heart is framed according to Gods heart, there is a covenant between God that wrote this Law, and him in whom it is written."[1]

---

[1] Rous, The Mysticall Marriage, p. 331.

[2] Ibid., p. 258. Rous quotes Rom 13: 10 and Jh. 14: 21, to support this passage. Especially interesting is the latter verse stating that he who keeps Christ's commandments loves him and will be loved by Him and by the Father who will manifest himself unto that one.

[3] Rous, The Mysticall Marriage, p. 259.

[4] Ibid., p. 255. See above, IV, 180.

In another passage Rous said that just as the pleasure of love and union in physical marriage is a "kinde of lure of fruitfulness" so in the "spirituall marriage, the joy of love and union is the lure of a fruitfull holiness," so "those that truly enjoy Christ in these spiritual accesses, both desire and obtain this spirituall fruitfulnesse; for the spouse of Christ is most truly that vine, which is fruitfull by the sides of the house, and whose children stand like olive plants: yea in olde age is she full of fruite."[2] Thus, if there is any result of the mystical marriage, it must include the production of spiritual children in the form of works of righteousness and holiness.

Rous thought of the results in a very concrete way. In speaking of the uses and advantages of the soul's visitation by Christ, he mentioned that it eventuated in an increase of power and prayer.[3] There are "tides of grace" that flow into man, and he should take advantage of them by setting upon his very hardest work, hitherto impossible, and he will conquer.[4] That same tide of power brings a great time of joy which enables one to work "comfortably in doing and suffering."[5] The joy of the heavenly visitation is not just for personal feelings but excites one to labor because "as naturall man pleaseth himselfe in eating and drinking so doth the spirituall man delight himself in well-doing; and it is meate and drinke to an heavenly Sonne, to doe the will of his heavenly Father."[1]

---

[1] Rous, The Heavenly Academie, pp. 116-117.

[2] Rous, The Mysticall Marriage, pp. 259-260. Rous took both of these ideas from the Old Testament. Ps. 128, and Ps. 92: 14.

[3] See above, IV, 170.

[4] Rous, The Mysticall Marriage, pp. 190-195.

[5] Ibid., pp. 198-199.

Again, the extremely close connection between heavenly visitation and earthly activity is treated in a full chapter of the Mysticall Marriage entitled, "The Heavenly Marriage is Happy Not only in the Pleasures but in the labours of love."[2] Rous points out that as in marriage so in the spiritual life there is a time to embrace and a time to work, and a time to please the husband by service as well a time to take pleasure in him.[3] The Lord expects service that he may be Lord not "in words onely, but in deedes, even in doing his will."[4] But doing his will is really "an easie yoake" for it is full of profit and brings rest.[5] The visitations are as "wages paid aforehand" offering "weightie joyes," "sweete embracements, and ravishing consolations" that man might cheerfully and confidently do "worke" of love and suffering.[6] They are as "angels food" preparing man for a long and laborious journey and giving him strength to walk to the "Mount of God." Thus man is not to "dreame of rest, but of labour; not of setting up Tabernacles, but of service and sufferings."[7]

During the very works themselves the soul has great gains in strength, pleasure, and delight. Once having tasted Christ in a heavenly communion, the soul has the law of love shed into her so it becomes a delight to fulfill the law.[1] "So she loves his law, because his law is lovely; she loves it because it is his law who she loves; she loves it because the love of his law is written in her heart."[2] Thus the soul wants to fulfill the law:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 200.

[2] Ibid., pp. 60-97.

[3] Ibid., pp. 60-62.

[4] Ibid., p. 63.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., pp. 67-69.

[7] Ibid., p. 68.

> . . . . for her love will not be quiet, untill it see her words turned into her deeds. And this she doth not negligently, nor heavily, but like a lover, pleasantly and cheerfully. And as the Sun in whom a law or covenant of motion is written, rejoyceth like a gyant to runne the race and motion of that covenant, so the soule in whom this law of love is written, rejoyceth to runne the race and motion of this law. Obedience is the kindly fruite of a loving soule, and a loving soule bringeth forth this fruite as kindly, as a good tree bringeth forth good fruite.[3]

Even present sufferings and crosses are turned into joys if the sufferings are for God. The greater the sufferings of love in labor the greater love of the Bridegroom for the Bride.[4] So, the higher and fuller the tribulations, the more abundant the consolations.[5] Works of love eventuating in seeming defeat and suffering are really gains in love for what the soul "loseth in the creature, shee hath repayed with great advantage in the Creatour. . . . ."[6]

Finally, the greatest gain of the soul is the ultimate rest when her labors follow her into heaven and bless her "with eternall joyes."[7] This is the point at which Rous attacks Christians who would have nothing but rest and enjoying at the present time. It is completely wrong to separate "mystical Divinity from practicall" for though they can be distinguished they cannot be separated. Labors and sufferings cannot be neglected or excluded, for that would turn a seed time into a harvest wherein the soul would devour the seed rather than sewing it.[1] Man has not received his "earnest-pennie" to be gazing on it or thinking himself rich in it. He is now at work in the six days of labor while there remains a rest for the children of God.[2] So Rous exhorts "let us enter into this rest by labour not by rest; or if by rest, by that rest, which encourageth us and enableth us to labour."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 69-70. Cf., Rous, Treatises, pp. 592, 533.

[2] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 71.

[3] Ibid., pp. 71-73.

[4] Ibid., p. 74.

[5] Ibid., pp. 78-79.

[6] Ibid., p. 80

[7] Ibid., pp. 82-83.

The balance maintained between present enjoyment of spiritual gifts yet the necessity of fulfillment in the future is illustrated by Rous where he says: "True it is that joyes are given thee here and they are given thee to be enjoyed: but even this enjoying is but a sowing: for thereby are sowne in thee new supplies of faith, hope, and love, and of all spirituall strength, even the seeds of future active and passive services."[4]

How then does Rous formulate the relation between contemplation and action? There are several possible solutions to the problem. One is quietism which utterly neglects the latter for the pursuit of the former.[5] Another solution, introduced by Augustine, finds the best life to be a mixture of the two but feels that contemplation is the better of the two for it is eternal and never passes away.[6] Action then becomes necessary because the

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 86.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 91; Rous takes the Sabboth rest from Heb. 4: 9, 6: 11.

[3] Rous, _Mysticall_ _Marriage_, pp. 90-92.

[4] _Ibid_., pp. 88-89.

[5] Quietism is best seen in the devotional writings of such seventeenth century French writers as Madame Guyon and Fénelon.

[6] Butler, _op_. _cit_., p. 200. Knowles, _op_. _cit_., pp. 150-177. Augustine Baker was the seventeenth century English representative of this view.

Church cannot spare men for exclusive contemplation , or because man cannot stay at the high peak of vision but must continually repair to the valley of ordinary life.[1] Those having the most unique advantages for the pursuit of contemplation are the hermits.[2] Thus, while Augustine doubtless emphasizes the importance of the active life and encourages the mixed life of contemplation and action, his preference is ultimately for contemplation as indicated by his exegesis of the Mary and Martha Biblical story.[3]

Gregory also, following Augustine, thought that the contemplative life, though not as productive as the active, is better and greater.[4] The contemplative life is greater in merit than the active "and it also tastes with inward savour the rest that is to come."[5] At the same time Gregory encourages a mixture of the two lives that the flame of zeal might be continually renewed for continued production of good works.[6] But one is to remember that: "secular business is sometimes to be borne with, out of compassion, but never to be sought for love."[7] Secular work , conceived of as the active priesthood over against the regulars, should be undertaken when it is commanded by superiors or when there is a lack of workers. But it is always to be followed by periods of contemplations; so, really a true mixed life is the most excellent in the present state of existence. Theoretically, the contemplative life is superior. Rous saw this in Gregory when he quoted him as the early church father who upheld the superiority of the contemplative over the active life.[1] St. Bernard also speaks of the necessity of a mixed life, but at the same time extolls the contemplative as the part to be chosen while the active is to be "patiently borne" if it is laid upon one.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 195 ff.

[2] Ibid., p. 210.

[3] Ibid., p. 200.

[4] Ibid., p. 218.

[5] Gregory, Homilie on Ezekiel, I, iii, 9 quoted in Butler, op. cit., p. 219.

[6] Gregory, Morals, XXX, 8, quoted in Butler, op. cit., p. 224.

[7] Gregory, Book on the Pastoral Care, II, 7; quoted in Butler, op. cit., p. 226.

It is hardly necessary to proceed any further in Roman Catholic mysticism to determine the relation between contemplative life and the active life because Augustine and Gregory in particular, and Bernard as well, exhibit the balance, between action and contemplation, which characterizes the most sane and fruitful mystics in Catholicism. That is not to overlook Tauler who, to my knowledge, above all other Roman Catholic mystics made the strongest statements affirming the superiority of the active over the contemplative life. Spiritual enjoyments are to be taken only to feed the soul for further activity.[3] However, the attitude of the three men cited proved predominant among the vast majority of Catholic mystics who showed a vital interest in the active life.

The following generalizations do not seem out of place. On the whole, contemplation is superior to action, though action also has a necessary place in the total spiritual life.[4] But that place seems to be one of a handmaid to contemplation. While action is often spoken of as the inevitable outcome of contemplation, its real significance and place seem to be that of " a convenient refuge," when the soul is not capable of further sustained contemplation.[1] Action then becomes both an expression of what was experienced, and even more, a means of returning to the experience itself.[2]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 147.

[2] Bernard, Serm. de div. LX, 4., quoted in Butler, op. cit., p. 246.

[3] John Tauler, "Sermon for the Fourth Sunday after Trinity," History and Life of the Reverend Doctor John Tauler with Twenty-Five Sermons, trans. Susanna Winkworth (New York: Wiley and Halsted, 1858), pp. 404 f.

[4] Butler, op. cit., pp. 200 f., 218 ff.

Several things should be kept in mind when dealing with the Catholic ideal of the "mixed life." Not only is action a place of refuge for the soul not in contemplation, it is also a physical and social necessity.[3] It is humanly impossible to maintain a purely contemplative life, so the necessity of action, either within the regular monastic life or secular clerical activities, becomes imperative. When the superiors of the Church call upon the contemplatives for work they are to respond neither with refusal nor with keen elation.[4]

Thus in spite of the many beautiful passages in Bernard, Richard of St. Victor and other fruitful mystics, one cannot but feel that action is not on an equal footing with contemplation but is the subordinate component of the "mixed life." It appears to be more a temporary respite from and preparation for reinvigorated contemplation rather than an equal component of similar value in this life.

Furthermore, the Catholic mystics' concept of "action" was defined primarily in such terms as preaching, teaching, ecclesiastical administration and other such secular clerical activities. This was necessarily so because the contemplative led either an ascetic or semi-ascetic life. While the giants among Roman mysticism always felt the mystical way was open to all people, the unmarried state, the clerical state, and above all the hermit state (or at least the solitary state), offered the best possibilities for the life of contemplation.[1] Action or the active life was not the fulfillment of one's everyday calling in faith, love, and obedience but consisted in the performance of the activities of the sacramental Church.

---

[1] Bernard, _Cantica_ _Canticorum_, LI, 2, quoted in Butler, _op_. _cit_., p. 248. Cf., _ibid_., pp. 218 ff., 223, 226, 229.

[2] _Ibid_., pp. 218, 219.

[3] _Ibid_., pp. 205, 206, 207, 218 f., 247, 248.

[4] Augustine, _Ep_. XLVIII, quoted in Butler, _op_. _cit_., p. 206.

Francis Rous held a conception of the relation between the active and contemplative life that differed in several respects from that of the Catholic mystics. While he was a mystic of a high rank and valued contemplation and the spiritual marriage union experience as of primary importance, he did not hesitate to place the active life on an equal par with it. Contemplation "must not" be for itself, "but it must proceed" from and "end in action."[2] But on the other hand action is not simply for action's sake but is for the providing of "happiness to be enjoyed in another world."[3]

That talent which God has given us must be put to use for no man can be idle here and glorious hereafter. God has given man a body and soul and expects service from both in works of piety and charity or "even of mutual help and benefit, as being part not of a separation, but of a Communion of Saints."[4] The true relation between activity and contemplation is "that Contemplation nourish and feed Action, but not devour it: that we contemplate to know God and to love God, and serve him in the actions of some profitable vocation."[1]

---

[1] Gregory, Homily on Ezekiel, II, iv, 6., quoted in Butler, op. cit., p. 233. Gregory, Hom. Ez., II, v, 19, 20, quoted in Butler, op. cit., p. 239.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 147. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

Especially interesting is his use of Scripture to support his contention. While accepting the traditional mystical interpretation of the Mary-Martha passage in the New Testament, he counterbalanced its significance by stating that the same Mary who sat at Jesus's feet to hear, was at a different time active in anointing Jesus's feet.[2] Then, too, he pointed to Jesus' inquiry of Peter as recorded in the gospel of John. After thrice receiving the answer that Peter loved him Jesus did not say Peter should contemplate him, but should feed Jesus's sheep. This passage, says Rous, "shows that a life of Action and Edification is the most noble Fruit, and notable effect which Christ expects from his Lovers."[3] Finally he interprets the judgment scene as Christ calling the blessed of his Father not those who have continually "beheld me with your Contemplations," but "ye who have spiritually and corporally fed me, clóthed me, and visited me in my members."[4]

With Rous contemplation and action seem to be in a better balance than in the Catholic mystics, and the results of the harmony between the two are channeled in an ethical direction within the world. Contemplation heats the soul into action, but action appears as the bud from the root. The direction in Rous is from contemplation to action rather than action as a second best, though necessary state, to contemplation. There is a true harmony between them whereby one never serves only as a handmaid to the other. He says: "The excellency of Contemplation and Action is the Concord of them; therefore let us be contemplative that we may be active, and our activeness strive verly to express our Contemplation."[5]

If anything, Rous places more emphasis on the ethical results of heavenly visitations than he does on the enjoyment of them in themselves. The more contemplation a man has the more service he must render.[1] Contemplation becomes the dynamic which impels man to righteousness and holiness in whatever his vocation happens to be. The fashion and form given to those actions is not left to chance but is explicitly stated to be the law of God as expressed in the first and second tables of the Mosaic law.[2] More will be said of that later.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 148. [2] *Ibid*., p. 147.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 148. [4] *Ibid*. [5] *Ibid*., p. 149.

The difference between Rous and Catholic mystics on this one point is a difference of direction and emphasis which has far-reaching implications. For Rous contemplation must end in action and holiness of life or it is not full contemplation. The doctrine of "spiritual children" was not erotic symbolism carried to its logical conclusions, but it offered Rous a symbolic way of expressing the most intimate connexion between his mysticism and his virile Puritan ethic. Works were the logical and necessary consequence of spiritual visitations and were not places of refuge until further contemplation. The mixed life meant for Rous not the predominance of contemplation but a complete concord between it and action eventuating in ethical activity in one's calling.

That is the final point of difference between Rous and Catholic mystics. All of Rous's mystical treatises and other treatises were prefaced by appeal to the general congregation of believers. Action was conceived of not as certain practices within the Church prescribed for the laity or carried on by the secular clergy, but the life of action was a life of holiness and righteousness, according to the moral law of God, carried out in whatever the believer's vocation happened to be.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 161.

[2] Ibid., p. 533.

The great emphasis placed upon works or activity immediately raises the question of the relation of good works to man's salvation. Salvation is the result of predestinating grace and the response of faith grafting the believer into the body of Christ.[1] But what Rous does insist upon is the simultaneous gift of justification and sanctification.[2] Works, then, are the product of a sanctified man, that "express the vertue of the union, they praise and glorifie him that bestowed the union; they are excellent as fruits, but they have both being and excellence from him whom faith apprehendeth."[3]

Man was delivered from his old enemies, sin and the devil, that he might serve God without fear.[4] Ultimately God makes possible man's activity in good works and crowns them in eternity as his gifts;[5] thus the glory of God goes out to man only to return to God in glory. Let not God lose his glory by man's failing to do good works or doing them for merit or credit.[6] Just as God has been plentiful in bestowing grace so let man be plentiful in returning glory. God expects great glory through a higher fruitfulness in the man of grace who works both in word and deed.[7]

In one passage Rous speaks of good works as assuring proof for one's election. According to Troeltsch and Weber's analysis of Puritan mysticism, Rous's treatises would be the last place to find a passage such as this: "Again, works are to us strong evidences of the spirit of Life, and therefore as sure as we would be of our salvation, so careful let us be of good works: shameful it were for them who are so scrupulous and eager for security concerning temporal things not to be more eager for the assuring of their Election."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 491, 527.

[2] Ibid., p. 311. See above, III.

[3] Rous, Treatises, p. 527.

[4] Ibid., p. 124.

[5] Ibid., p. 491; Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 168; Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 95.

[6] Rous, Treatises, p. 154.

[7] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 183 f.

This passage is, however, the only one so clearly linking good works with the proof of election. Rous's treatises do not abound with that sentiment though it is always present as a vital part of his theology.

Before concluding this section on the relation of the visitations to ethical practices it should be strnngly emphasized that Rous also conceived of the love of God as a dynamic bond between his mysticism and ethic. Just as all good mystics,[2] Rous found an important place for love in his theology.[3] It was the "root of obedience" and means of fulfilling the Mosaic law.[4]

From the union of man with God, man is given the image of God, and from that image there proceeds a love of God.[5] Rooted in Christ man has a divine-human life of love which expresses itself outwardly in good actions.[6] His being rooted in Christ, his union with God, his being a branch in a vine are all productive of a particular disposition which eventuates in a love and charity for neighbors and sobriety in oneself.[7] It is a pleasure for the soul to be bound to God because of her love for him.[1] The service one renders as a result of her love is a noble service because it proceeds from love and acts voluntarily, cheerfully, and pleasantly.[2] The soul loves to do the will of him whom she loves.

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 492.

[2] Underhill, op. cit., see the index.

[3] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 79-86.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 533.

[5] Ibid., p. 112.

[6] Ibid., p. 493.

[7] Ibid., pp. 511, 535, 112.

The result of that love cannot be solitary or fruitless but must bring forth peace and unity.[3] This becomes the basis for Francis Rous's conception of toleration which will be discussed in a later chapter. Love, to be true love, must be towards Christ, a love for his Word and will, and a love of the members of Christ.[4] It is not a vague emotional love but a socially oriented power. The saints "have fed, cloathed and visited Christ, in his hungry, naked, and imprisoned members; these works are the fruits of Love, and Love is the Fruite of Sanctification, and Sanctification is an inseparable Companion, condition, and witness of Justification."[5] Thus his conception of love, central to his mystical theology, was another means of vitalizing believers in productivity of actions. Final conclusions as to the significance of Rous's treatment of the relation between the two lives will be reserved until the conclusion of this chapter.

## II

"Spiritual children" produced by the mystical marriage as fruits of the union experience was the means whereby Francis Rous made an intimate connection between his mysticism and his Puritan ethic. It prevented his mystical theology from degenerating into a pious emotionalism devoid of social and ethical concern, and it provided a dynamic basis for his Puritan ethic which insured a theology of ethical orientation rationally conceived but richly endowed with emotional appeal.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 300-301.

[2] Ibid., p. 109.

[3] Ibid., pp. 339 ff.

[4] Ibid., p. 574.

[5] Ibid., p. 89.

In contradistinction to Roman Catholic mysticism he conceived of the active life as the full partner of the contemplative life and an absolute inevitable result of a true spiritual marriage. The active life was lived in terms of God's moral law producing a life of holiness, righteousness, and sobriety in one's regular vocation. It was a wholehearted attempt at a genuine balance between the emotional and rational elements of the religious life making full use of all factors of existence to produce joy and assurance in this life as a foretaste of one's true end in eternal life.

It is quite evident that Rous succeeded in protecting his mystical theology from the danger of indifference and inactivity. His own busy life is eloquent testimony to the success of the endeavor to combine mysticism with a Puritan ethic. As yet it has not been shown that Rous's ethic was a Puritan ethic. While he did succeed in preventing inactivity, he also succeeded in systematizing moral activity in such a way that he avoided the danger of antinomianism.

With his conception of the spiritual marriage, the law written in the heart, and the intense activity of the Spirit, it would have been a simple matter to say that the believer has passed beyond the written law and is responsible only to the spirit of Christ. No man knowing the Spirit but he who has it, there remains no adequate moral or social control on the individual and he believes himself to have transcended the law. Antinomianism is the result. Rous never succomed to this temptation.

The point at which this danger became greatest was that of the heavenly visitations, but Rous wisely propounded a number of checks or tests to determine the validity of the experience.[1] When Rous says that in the saints "the Spirit of God, is the last resort, rest and Pillar of Truth,"[2] he does not abrogate Scripture and moral law but means that it is only through the Holy Spirit that man experiences his salvation and truly understands Scripture or fulfills the law.[3] Such an interpretation is indicated by the checks upon the validity of the heavenly visitations worked by the Spirit. Rous recognizes that visitations could be either a product of man's own fancy or the operation of an evil Angel.[4] But, he indicates three criteria for testing the validity of such a visitation. A true spiritual experience will bring light, joy,and holiness. All of these were treated in the chapter immediately preceding this one.[5]

The light which the Spirit brings in such visitations enables the soul to see things never seen before. It is a "kinde of Oracle that gives divine answers and resolutions."[6] However, the answers given do not contradict the revealed will of God in Scripture but only enhance and make it more discernable.[7] Furthermore, this light is superior to reason but never outrages reason. Rather than shocking reason by extravagance, the divine light is proved so superior by experience that natural reason gladly surrenders to it.[8]

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, pp. 225-266.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 196.

[3] See above, III, passim.

[4] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 227-229.

[5] See above, III, 19 f., IV, 36 ff.

[6] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 238. See above, IV, 38 f.

[7] Ibid., pp. 235 f. See above III, 20.

[8] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 238. See above, IV, 38 f.

The new joy which flows into the heart of man is a spiritual joy which nourishes not man's body but his spirit. It can be discerned as a heavenly joy because it rejoices in doing the will of Christ but despises the things loved by natural man.[1] But, the most important test for Rous is that of holiness. He says: "Wherefore if with light and joy, the soule doe feele, that the Spirit of Christ, by spirituall heate, power, and love, have wrought a powerful, and fruitfull holiness in her, let her know that Christ Jesus himselfe hath beene with her."[2] The power of holiness shed into man's heart is defined in terms of the law.[3] The Mosaic law might then be spiritualized and written not in external letters but in man's heart; nevertheless, it is still the law written in Scripture which evidences man's holiness. The only difference is that man now fulfills the law because the love of Christ constrains him to do the will of God. Love, not compulsion, is the seat of obedience.[4] The moral law, not man's imagination or fancy, is the content of holiness.

Rous further elaborated the tests of heavenly teaching in another treatise and posited purity, love and peace as additional criteria.[5] Men may be certain that they are not taught by their vain imaginations if, in addition to the things mentioned above, their theology and life stand the tests of purity, love and peace. The Lord's teaching is "first pure, and then peaceable" and so are those men taught by God. Man should, then, "trie thy teaching, whether it bee of God, first try whether it bee pure, that is agreeable with the Word,"[1] and then "consider, whether it doe not favour of love, and agree with that meeke and quite spirit; which of God is much esteemed" for men of God "are taught to love, and the God of peace doth fill them with the peace of God."[2] Rous succeeded not only in protecting his mysticism from vain imagination, excesses, and antinomianism, but he also laid a firm theological basis for a concept of toleration.

---

[1] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 247-254.

[2] Ibid., p. 260. [3] Ibid., pp. 260 ff.

[4] Ibid., p. 258.

[5] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 79-84, 162-164; Rous, Treatises, pp. 603 ff.

Having guarded against possible misinterpretations of life in the Spirit Rous also delineated the rule of the Spirit or the path chalked out by the Spirit wherein man was to walk.[3] In the chapter on soteriology and the Holy Spirit it was established that salvation was fully worked out in calling, justification, and regeneration.[4] The result was the birth of a new man or new principle guiding man.[5] Placed in the path chalked out by the Spirit, it became man's task to perform that duty for which he was enabled.[6] Just as man yielded himself in "a generall submission unto the spirit, so must hee doe in every particular action; "thus man enters the process of sanctification.[7] This can be described as a continual repetition, on a much smaller scale, of man's original conversion experience. That is, man continues to sin, even though he grows in grace, and he must receive continual forgiveness and renewal.[8]

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 163-164.

[2] Ibid., p. 164.

[3] Rous, Treatises, pp. 31, 301. The "rule of the Spirit" and the "path of the Spirit" were terms used by Rous to indicate his ethic and other activities of the Spirit.

[4] See above, II, III, passim. Cf., Rous, Treatises, pp. pp. 509 f.

[5] Ibid., p. 31.

[6] Ibid., pp. 30, 50, 498.

[7] Ibid., p. 511.

[8] Ibid.

8

Thus, a twofold relation is evident in Rous's conception of the rule of the Spirit. Man in his fallen estate could do nothing for salvation, but God has done all for him and applied it to the believer through the Spirit. Now, man must do that which he was enabled to do and cooperate in the process of sanctification. Here too he is dependent upon the Spirit who not only delivers man from positive evil but also "goes farther in his bounty, and restoreth to us a certain ability of performing our duty."[1] Through one's union with Christ wrought by faith, he is surrendered to the sanctification of the Spirit and should, then, "strive to preserve and increase our selves therein."[2]

What sanctification accomplishes, or in what direction the path of the Spirit leads, can easily be described as holiness. "Where God will bring any to him, he puts holiness upon them,"[3] and the way he accomplishes that is through the same Spirit that regenerates man.[4] Sanctification can also be viewed as the process of deification whereby man through frequent visitations of the Bridegroom operating through the Spirit is gradually made more conformable to the image of God or more righteous and holy.[5] This is absolutely essential both from the temporal and eternal viewpoint. Only holiness and righteousness in life returns glory to God, and it is man's duty in love to glorify God. Such action is profitable in the present and increases one's glory hereafter.[6]

It is the duty and benefit of man to nourish the Spirit, to kindle and enflame it, or man will "decay" his life and strength.[7]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 531.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[5] See above, IV, 179 ff.

[6] Rous, *Treatises*, p. 51.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 52, 491.

The Spirit grows by exercise, so it behoves man to conform himself to the deeds and words of the Spirit.[1] The path of the Spirit is beset by many difficulties, so man dare not neglect the Spirit. Said Rous:

> Remember that thy warfare is against the whole Nation of the Canaanites, thou maist not suffer a little one to live. Thou must strive against all sinne, and strive for all righteousnesse; for the fruit of the spirit, is all goodnesse, righteousnesse, and truth.[2]

It is clear by now that Rous had no doctrine of perfectionism. The path of the Spirit never led beyond sinfulness in this life, but man remained a saint and a sinner until he passed to his eternal rest. Though man is "new married to the Spirit: there are certain Cartropes of sin, which were once fast tyed betweene the flesh and the world" that were cut by the Spirit, but now "the wicked spirit seeks to knit [them] again by conversation."[3] The Christian always retains a twofold nature that is at war in him.[4] In regeneration man was returned to a state of freedom from the dominion of lust, but there still remained a mighty law in his members rebelling against the law of his mind.[5] The seed of God is in man, but also a remainder of the old Adam's nature is present.[6] Man has not received sufficient grace to abolish grace entirely, but only so much as "may exclude the dominion of sin, but not abolish the being of it."[7]

Rous attempts a short theodicy to explain why sin is not fully conquered in this life. While he gives six reasons for that state of affairs, they all converge on the determinant as the will and glory of God. He traces the condition of man as saint and sinner to the will of God who has a plan for the total existence of man. Such a state keeps man humble by making him fully dependent upon God; again, it brings more glory to God who uses so little grace to overcome such a great opposition; and also, it offers a more fruitful ground for the growth of the spirit of man here so his glory may be greater hereafter.[1] Rous was a good Puritan in maintaining this doctrine, and it was a further check against antinomianism in his mysticism.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 31, 203.

[2] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, p. 196.

[3] Rous, Treatises, p. 57.

[4] Ibid., pp. 55, 61.

[5] Ibid., p. 454.

[6] Ibid., p. 497.

[7] Ibid., p. 498.

Another indication of the Puritan bent of his ethic was his insistence that in the struggle within the rule of the Spirit man might never achieve perfection, but he need never fear falling from grace. The seed of Christ poured into the heart in regeneration was an immortal seed,[2] and though at times it was suppressed by the flesh or lived in bondage to lust, it could never be put to death.[3] With this remaining seed God is never angry though his wrath remains constant against sin.[4] God proves stedfast from election to glorification, his will holds man, his love will not let man go, his Spirit works a constant reformation in the elect, the seed of God remains an immortal seed which is never fully rooted up by sin; thus the elect persevere in grace to eternal life.[5]

Against the accusation that such a doctrine is dangerous to morality Rous replies that "it is a spurre and encouragement unto obedience."[6] This is so because God has delivered the saints, and this doctrine is for them alone. The regenerate have filial obedience and love in them, so there is little danger of abuse.[1] It is of great benefit because man may always be "bold, amidst tribulations and afflictions, amidst terrors without, and terrors within: for the seal of God remaineth upon us inviolable; and the Lord, who knows who are his, hath told us that we are his."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 32 ff., 483. [2] Ibid., p. 38.

[3] Ibid., p. 498. [4] Rous, Testis Veritates, p. 78.

[5] Ibid., pp. 47, 49, 50, 62, 69, 70, 71, 77, 78, 80.

[6] Ibid., p. 82.

The two doctrines of growth in grace and assurance of the elect were complimentary and so supplemented one another. The former prevented excesses and kept the believer in continual need of the grace of God. The latter prevented the saint from total despair when the sinner was predominant over the saint. Also, it was a source of strength in time of trouble and the basis of a vigorous ethical outlook. For Rous these two central Puritan doctrines could be surrendered at no cost. While he occasionally sniped at fanatics who felt they were in a state of perfection, he threw his full weight into the fight against Arminianism in the Church of England.

At this point a few words should be said about Rous's view on the sacraments. They were an integral part of the rule of the Spirit, and they were of great value to the saint who continually struggled with sin.[3] Dr. Nuttall has pointed out that the Puritan interest in the sacraments reflects much the same variety of opinion as that expressed by Puritan discussion of the Spirit and the Word.[1] Though his particular interest is in the Holy Spirit and Puritan thought, his treatment sheds light on many hitherto seemingly incomprehensible attitudes of Puritan theologians towards various questions.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[2] Rous, Treatises, p. 38.

[3] Logically, the discussion of the Church and sacraments should appear after the treatment of salvation and the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, but for our purposes it was thought advisable to include such a discussion under the general heading of life in the Spirit. It was done to show that Rous, as a mystic, not only held to a full Puritan ethic but also had a high doctrine of the church and sacraments. This was due more to his mysticism than to his Puritanism for in many respects his doctrine of the church and sacraments is of a "higher" type than that of the average English Puritan.

On the whole Francis Rous held a higher conception of the sacraments than the average Puritan. Mystics have usually taken one of two attitudes towards the sacraments. Either they looked upon them as useful stimulants to piety to be used in the early stages of the mystical life, though many continued to use sacraments out of respect for the church, or they looked upon them as vital symbols whereby union with the divine is attained, maintained, or enhanced.[2]

Rous felt that the sacraments and word were the "ordinary means which Christ hath left to maintain his life of religion," and that they were to be dispensed by ministers at a fit time in a fit place.[3] The nearest he comes to formulating a view of the sacraments is in the following passage:

> The Sacraments also Christ hath imprinted with his own resemblance: and they are the characters and representations of Christ. So in them may we see Christ redeeming by passion, and washing by regeneration, feeding and quicking by vivification, yea performing his part of the whole Covenant of Life.[4]

Such language verges on the border of a real presence theory despite the fact he continually uses new covenant terminology. In another place he said Christ's business is to wash us in this world that we might be presented spotless to his Father in eternity. As he washes man by his blood and Spirit "so he washeth us ministerially by His Word, by his Sacraments, by his keyes; for by these the Blood and Spirit which wash us are more neerly applyed, and more fully communicated."[1] Life is communicated by the Lord's Supper, but how this actually occurs Rous never explicates.[2]

---

[1] Nuttall, op. cit., pp. 90-101. Cf., P. Miller, "The Puritan Theory or the Sacraments in Seventeenth Century in New England," The Catholic Review, XXII (1937), 409-435.

[2] Inge, op. cit., pp. 260 ff.; Underhill, Mysticism, pp. 197, 435 f.

[3] Rous, Treatises, p. 240.

[4] Ibid., p. 53.

Man's baptism is both inward and outward and both are at once performed.[3] It is spoken of as the water of purification because in it the double disease of corruption and guilt are washed away by justification and sanctification. Exactly how this double gift could operate in infant baptism Rous never explained. In his hands the doctrine sounds much like the water of regeneration concept. Just as Luther advises in the Small Catechism, Rous encourages men to have a daily recourse to baptism "(to wit, by the outward remembering and passing to the inward) that the stock of justification, and sanctification at first imparted may be daily supplied, and distributed to our particular necessities."[4]

The highly sacramental conception is again indicated where he says:

> When thou wast baptized into Christ, thou didst put on Christ; and when thou eatest the spirituall meat, and drinkest the spirituall drink in the Eucharist, those doest put him on more and more. Thy being in Christ, even thy new being, which thou receivest before, thou doest now feed and nourish, and bring forth into manhood.[5]

Spiritual and inward cleansing can take place only by means of the Spirit operating through these chosen channels and those are ordinarily the Word and sacraments;[6] man should "therefore love and embrace the means of thy inward puritie, and take willingly not one but all helps that beautifie thee."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 191. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., pp. 512. Cf., pp. 68, 320, 524. [4] Ibid., p. 512.

[5] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 138-139.

[6] Rous, Treatises, pp. 598, 191.

His treatment of the sacraments from within the sphere of covenant theology was likewise extended beyond the usual interpretation. The seals of the new covenant not only confirmed, sealed, and increased the faith of the elect but also increased "union with Christ Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant."[2] In the Lord's Supper the believer is actually repeating the covenant and preparing himself for a fuller obedience to its obligations.[3] Such problems as over-dependence on the sacraments, the attitude for reception, or fencing the table were not treated by Rous. Sufficient has been said to show that he did not hold a spiritualist view of the sacraments, and certainly he was not of the radical Puritan wing's interpretation.

His attitude towards the Church is another interesting indication of the consequences of his mysticism. For the first half of his public career he was a Presbyterian, or at least called himself that and was so accepted by such a staunch Presbyterian as Baillie. The Church was the home of the man living in the path chalked out by the Spirit. The Word and sacraments being the ordinary means the Spirit used to effect one's calling, the Church was prior to the individual believer. But the marriage of the soul to Christ and the union resulting brought one into unity with the saints or a union of brethren.[4] Henceforth the Spirit which man possesses is strengthened by union with fellows possessing the Spirit.[5]

The Church is the "Bed of Solomon" in which the Christian gains warmth through fellowship.[1] Or again, the Church is composed of many men who together are like two strings vibrating in harmony to the same note--the Spirit.[2] Man would be foolish to forsake the fellowship and communion of saints for in it all are fellow "Pilgrims in a strange countrey."[3] Rous as most good Puritans of the center party believed the Church to be visible and invisible, and within the visible Church there were two types of people --the men of flesh and the men of Spirit.[4]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 137-138.

[3] Rous, Treatises, p. 301.

[4] Ibid., p. 36. [5] Ibid., pp. 73 ff.

Rous always maintained a high conception of the ministry though he never attempted to enter the ministry. Running through all of his treatises like a single motif is an intense concern for a consecrated, decently paid ministry adequately supplying all the English parishes. This will be treated in detail in the chapter on his Parliamentary activities leading towards toleration.

The minister is a seer and crier on the watchtower to note man's sin and God's judgments and so reproach, exhort, and comfort.[5] The ministry as an office is a sacred office which is not compromised even by unconsecrated pastors.[6] While preferring a consecrated ministry because then the Spirit "speaketh twice by Illumination and Sanctification,"[7] he was not a Donatist in saying that such was absolutely necessary.[8] God alone may have the glory of man's salvation, and though eloquence and piety help, it is the Spirit who effects life in the hearer.[9]

One of the most interesting factors in Rous's mystical theology was his treatment of worship. Again he kept a fine balance between externals as necessary and indispenable symbols and the Spirit as imperative for life; hence it is impossible to classify him as a spiritualist. He asserted that the Spirit taught man and met with them publically in Church and privately in the heart.[1] But in the Church, the believer worships in unison with others and so is assured of the Lord's presence. Especially does this apply to prayer because the more hearts joined in a petition the more powerful the prayer with God.[3]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 74.

[4] Ibid., pp. 317, 192.

[5] Ibid., pp. 275, 527.

[6] Ibid., p. 564.

[7] Ibid., p. 158.

[8] Ibid., pp. 157, 183.

[9] Ibid., pp. 158, 159.

In several places Rous spoke of worship in such a way that if one does not take the statements as part of his total outlook he will be misled into a misinterpretation of Rous's intention. One such statement is: "He that freed true worship from being tied to Jerusalem, and tied it to the service of the Spirit which may be in all places, gave true Religion a large scope, even as large as the world itself."[4] True worship was always to be in spirit and truth and was to contain spiritual truths discernible only to spiritual minds.[5] That did not mean the total spiritualization of all worship or suspension of contemporary forms to await a fresh revelation of truth.[6] The statement itself was directed against Rome, and for its proper interpretation can be understood only in light of his interpretation of the Church and sacraments. The important thing was the Spirit, for he wrought truth in the heart and made religion "experimentall," but the Spirit worked through external means which were not to be transcended nor even subordinated through indifference. All externals were in one way subordinate to the Spirit but they were also normally indispensable.

---

[1] Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 128 ff.

[2] Ibid., pp. 142-143.

[3] Ibid., pp. 141-142, 143-145.

[4] Rous, Treatises, p. 576.

[5] Ibid., p. 196.

[6] William Dell, Select Works of William Dell (London: John Kendall, 1773), p. 391.

## III

At the beginning of this chapter three questions were propounded. Thus far, two of them have been treated rather fully in whole or in part. It was contended that Rous's doctrine of the relation between contemplation and action differed from the average Roman Catholic mystic's attitudes in at least two ways. He conceived of action as the direction towards which contemplation tended, and he channeled the results of contemplation into everyday activities. Also, his Puritan ethic was partially outlined, and its relation to the Mosaic law and the believers vocation was treated. However, sufficient evidence has not yet been given to prove beyond a doubt that he possessed a Puritan ethic which was not transcended but strengthened by his bridal mysticism.

The full outline of his concept of "spiritual offspring" and of the relation between the active and contemplative lives should be sufficient evidence to establish the intimate connexion between his mystical theology and ethical activity. The question now emerges, was his ethic a Puritan ethic and did it have a practical, rational direction? Upon the answer to these two questions depends the contention of this chapter and the correctness of certain generalizations by Weber and Troeltsch concerning the author and the supposed religious movement he illustrates.

The ultimate purpose of good works and all acts of virtue enacted by man in the process of sanctification was the glory of God. Rous devoted a full treatise to predestination with the primary aim to prove that man's being, salvation, and life of sanctification were all from and for the glory of God.[1] He never tires of stating in multifarious ways that the "seeds and laws of virture" are from God and for God.[2] God is the author and end of being and virtue, and to glorify and praise him is the only fit endeavor of man.[3] In the preface to his first treatise Rous wrote: "But let our chief joy and glory be, to glorifie God, and by being written in heaven, to be admitted unto the beholding of his glory."[4] Illustrated in that statement is his twofold interest in the beholding of God, or the vision of God, and the glory of God as the fit end of man.

In the preface to The Heavenly Academie, Rous states that the heavenly gifts of God move in a circular motion as heavenly bodies and return to the place from whence they came. God's graces go out to man and they return in works as glory to God.[5] Man glorifies God by admitting that all is from him and returns to him. By glorifying him through works which he produces in man, man is glorified by God.[6] Man's eternal glory will be increased because he has "served God in a bitter conflict," and the "more is the present labour, the more shall be the future joy; the hardness of the Victory shall increase the glory of the triumph; and opposition it self shall become our advancement."[7] So the "greatest seekers of happiness" are in the front line of battle against evil and proclaim both "the exceeding happiness of the presence of God" and "that this world is nothing comparable to the next."[1]

---

[1] Rous, "The Great Oracle," Treatises, pp. 651-673. Cf., ibid., pp. 159, 599, 455.

[2] Ibid., p. 107.

[3] Ibid., pp. 107, 110, 303, 304.

[4] Ibid., pp. 489-490.

[5] Rous, Heavenly Academie, preface.

[6] Ibid., pp. 182-186.

[7] Rous, Treatises, p. 32.

All things in life had to be leveled to the glory of God. This is the source of the Puritan hierarchy of value in which the world and all things therein are of use not in and for their own intrinsic value or enjoyment but only insofar as they serve man in his relation to God and his glory. The necessity to use the world, but only in service to God, is well illustrated in the following excerpt:

> There is nothing in us lovely to God, but righteousness, and that which advanceth it; and there is nothing odious to God but sin, and that which severth it. If therefore the Creatures of God be used toward the advancement, and encouragement of Gods service in us, we please him in their use, yea, we offend him in their neglect.[2]

Rous never ceased to exhort his readers to turn their attention from this world and seek their true rest only in heaven, "for this world was made for the next."[3] This world is a "vanity of vanties" in which man gets no more from the world "then God alloweth the world to give."[4] The world itself is under change and is perishing, and it can give man nothing but unrest. So Rous continues "Therefore not using this world as a place of certainty and rest . . . . yet let us use it as a Nurcery and School for heaven, which it is."[5]

If the world is a nursery for the next world and if God uses the world to give the believer certain things, then while one cannot make the world the end of his endeavors he must use the world for God's glory  and his own glory in eternity. Most interesting is Rous's attitude towards riches for it shows how he conceived of man's relations in the economic sphere. For a man to seek wealth for the sake of wealth, was an evident sin. Labor, in itself, while imposed on man by the fall was also a cure for man in that it kept him busy and also kept him humble.[1] So a man could profitably employ all his natural abilities, physical and intellectual, to maintain his own person, his family, and to aid the work of God's Church.[2] Man should work strongly in what God has imposed upon him because after the six days labor comes the rest of the seventh.[3]

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 33.
[2] _Ibid._, p. 115.

[3] _Ibid._, pp. 495, 549, 561, 171.

[4] _Ibid._, pp. 537-538.

[5] _Ibid._, pp. 538. Cf., p. 515.

In another passage Rous attacks "hungry pinching holiness" or those men who save much here but do not care what they have hereafter. Such a man desires God's will "towards most obtaining of the world."[4] Over against that man,is placed the man of heaven who has God for his main end, levels the whole world to God, and studies "to convert the world to most glory and pleasure of God."[5] There is, then, a "lawful conversion of riches into good works."[6] Keeping in mind these passages and recalling those quoted above on the relation of "spiritual offspring" to ethical activity of good works in "some profitable vocation,"[7] let us turn to a passage in which Rous expresses the proper way to use riches of the world. Certainly this shows a subordination of economic gains to the glory of God thought out in a rational fashion. He said:

> The man truly renewed hath his treasure in Heaven. There is his Rest, there is his Happiness, there is his Country. This heavenly Man looks upon his Earthly Gods, and cats with himself, how much he may in good spiritual Husbandry lawfully return for Heaven, how much he may fitly give unto God, . . . . and being a Good Steward. . . . by all lawful diminutions,

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 600.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 562.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 583.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 151.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] See above, pp. 195, 201, 203, 204.

> he provides for the increase of his welcome and wel-fare in the place of his last and eternal Residence. Therefore doth this man also seek out the bounds of goodness, but it is to another end, even to find out how far he may righteously convert his temporal Riches to the glory of God, and advancement of his Soul. He casts with himself how much he may well spare for holy and charitable uses, and withal not be worse than an Infidel, that provides not for his Family.[1]

Trusting fully in God's will and in no way depending upon works for salvation, the saints strive to do the will of their Father. God shows his will because he wants it done.[2] So, works are to be done because they bring glory to God, they benefit mankind, they are good in themselves in that they are divine and heavenly offspring, and because they insure the believer of his election.[3] At all times these activities and works of man, done from within his vocation as well as from within the Church, are judged by the law of God or the ten commandments.[4] Nevertheless, Rous escapes all legalism through his view of the mystical marriage and union with God. The law is kept because the love of Christ writes it in the heart and constrains to action; thus there is a freedom in keeping the law which is entirely lacking in legalistic Puritanism.

Rous's interest in how man was to glorify God and bring forth good works was never confined to the individual's own little personal world to be evaluated only within the sphere of his own individual salvation. The entire community, the whole nation was called upon to live accordingly. While Rous did believe in discipline to insure this within the Church he seems to refer to it as primarily a spiritual office and thus exercisable on a nationwide scale only through the means of spiritual persuasion, public fasts and other such means.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 151. [2] Ibid., p. 491.

[3] Ibid., p. 491. See above, p.

[4] Rous, Treatises, pp. 519, 589, 534, 663.

As he surveyed the history of his nation, Rous saw the digitus Dei in the important events of history. His was not a narrow interest indifferent to public, social, or national problems and morality.[2] He wrote at least three treatises concerned specifically with the moral abuses rampant in the England of his day and attacked them as being responsible for the judgments of God upon the nation.[3] The only remedy was a public call to repentance with a consequent keeping of God's law. He wrote because he would save Israel "temporally" and "eternally."[4]

His interest also extended to education and the universities. Aside from the fact that late in life he was appointed provost of Eaton College, Oxford, he evidenced his intense interest by referring to universities as the "Salt of the Land," and he was worried whether the salt would lose its savour.[5] In one mystical treatise he evaluated knowledge and earthly scholarship as of greatest benefit in attaining the heavenly academy. Just as Christ made much use of the old creation to represent the new, so the scholar should gather in much from natural learning to use it when he gets to the new study.[6] Rous said: "Let an Heathen Logician or Philosopher be his Gibeonite to cleave wood and to draw water for his service in the Sanctuary."[7] The precepts and the patterns gained from their stories should serve as "spurs and incentives to grace, to goe beyond the effects of Nature."[1] These gifts of man in the old creation can grow in use to "become excellent instruments in the new state."[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., pp. 36-37, 118, 152, 211, 224, 225, 265. All these passages exhibit an interest in economic problems.

[3] Rous, "Diseases of the Time," "Oyl of Scorpions," "The Only Remedy That Can Save a People," Treatises, pp. 92-214; 215-280; 281-332.

[4] Ibid., p. 293.

[5] Ibid., p. 232.

[6] Rous, Heavenly Academie, p. 4.

[7] Ibid., p. 5.

In quaint yet well chosen phrases he summarizes the use of education in saying that "such old things as these are earthly needles, that may draw in heavenly truths. They are earthly glasses, that may help our eyes to a clearer discerning of heavenly images, they may help to illustrate, to insinuate, to convince and to give."[3]

If one were to outline completely the Puritan ethic of Francis Rous he would have to catalogue a list of concerns which included almost all the stock Puritan ethical interests of the seventeenth century. He did not wish to see men waste time, he wrote against such things as coveteousness, and on humility and good works, against extremities, against images and spiritual idolatry, on the use of the world, on writing cases of conscience, and on the name Puritan. He outlined the way to choose a proper wife, he opposed immoderate dress, the theatres, and was against cards, dice, lots and excessive drinking.[4] Throughout, his attacks and exhortations were full of zeal yet properly restrained in language and attitude. They frequently broke forth in such aphorisms as this: "A woman is a needle to pierce the heart and affections of man, and if she be wicked, the devil is the thread which follows after."[5]

In concluding the treatment of Rous's Puritan ethic it should be said that in spite of his many attacks listed above there flows throughout his writings a spirit of warmth and joy that ever bubbles forth. While it is difficult to determine to what extent the Puritan religion was sobriety personified, even to the exclusion of a spontaneous joyful spirit, it is evident that Rous had a rich emotional side to his Puritan life and contended that religion was joy as well as sobriety. He was not opposed to "Mirth, but Madness," not the good fellowship but the wicked passing under the name of good.[1] Of course, the saint's mirth must be "wise and reasonable."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 5-6. [2] Ibid., p. 8. [3] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[4] Rous, Treatises, pp. 38, 97, 115 f., 125 f., 131 f., 156 f., 166, 178 f., 211 f., 315 f., 320 f., 497 f., 508 f., 553 f., 554 f., 572 f., 588 f., 592 f. ; Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 47, 62 f.

[5] Rous, Treatises, p. 554.

It is quite evident that Rous's mysticism supplied not only a theoretical basis for his Puritan ethic but also an emotional strengthening of what could well have been a bare, cold, rational faith.[3] Immediately after speaking of the place of joy in life, he says one can be assured religion is joyful for once becoming a freeman in the Spirit of Christ Jesus, man "will be ravished with the sweetness of God," and find that "his joys alone are pure and clear."[4] Then in a passage of exquisite beauty he sings the praises of religion:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 115. Cf., ibid., p. 164.

[2] Ibid., pp. 119-120. Cf., pp. 113, 603, 608.

[3] See above I, 30 ff. It is now clear that Francis Rous based his ethic on something entirely different from that which Max Weber considered the distinctive theoretical basis of the dynamic Puritan ethic. It was not the uncertainty of the believer standing under the doctrine of predestination which drove the Puritan to a methodically controlled life for the glory of God. It was, on the contrary, the certainty of divine love, the offspring of heavenly visitations, and the implanting of the love of God in the heart that drove Rous to systematically subdue all existence to the divine end. A combination of love, gratitude, and assurance provided just as secure a basis for the ethic of Francis Rous, and many other Puritans as well, as did the feeling of insecurity. Further research probably will show that Weber's characterization of the Puritan ethic as methodic and systematic is entirely correct, but that his placing the basis of that ethic in a sense of insecurity is not an accurtae description of seventeenth century Puritan theology.

[4] Rous, Treatises, pp. 119-120. Cf., 113, 603, 608.

> Religion is a loving and lovely thing, and the picture of it ought to be like itself. It is made all of light and love, and light and love are comfortable and amiable things, cheerfully communicating themselves to others, and alluring the eyes and hearts of others to behold and partake them. If Religion then be a drawer, be not thou a driver, neither do thou scare away with thy grimness, those whom Religion would allure with her beauties.[1]

It is now clear that Francis Rous had a Puritan ethic of no narrow scope. Its theoretical basis was found in Puritan theology tempered with a thoroughgoing mysticism. His anthropology, though greatly influenced by a definite tendency towards a _Lichtmetaphysik_, gave every indication of standing within the Augustinian-Calvinistic tradition. Salvation was described as the operation of predestinating effectual grace at work throughout history but culminating in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Just as covenant theologicans attempted to meet the problem posed by the arbitrary predestinating will of God, so did Rous attempt to meet it by encouraging each believer to strive mightily in preparation for the Spirit that he would not overlook any iota of grace.

It was through the Calvinistic-Puritan doctrine of the Holy Spirit that Rous found a theoretical basis for his mysticism. Christ, possessed of the Spirit in higher measure than any, was brought into a spiritual union or a mystical marriage with the soul of the believer. The direction of the mysticism was primarily from God to man that man might return glory to God. Union was worked out in the conception of the seed and covenant as well as the spiritual marriage.

In fervent, eloquent prose Rous attempted through marriage symbolism to convey some measure of the reality and joy of the union experience of the soul with Christ. The most remarkable aspect of his mysticism was the mighty impetus it gave to his Puritan ethic. Defining the end of contemplation as the vision of God or heavenly visitation by Christ the Bridegroom, its ultimate function was to impell the believer into a life of activity within his own vocation. Moral responsibility included all of society and its various problems, and the ultimate test of the individual's meeting those responsibilities was the keeping of a moral life and a life of social responsibility in righteousness and holiness.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 120.

Thus two of the questions raised in the opening pages of this chapter have received definitive answers. Rous's mysticism did differ from Roman Catholic mysticism in the way he explicated the relation between the contemplative and active lives. Not only did he differ in his conception of the relation between the two but also in the way the active life was fulfilled and the goal it had in view. It was fulfilled within the daily vocation, and its end was not primarily a return to contemplation, or the aquisition of merit, but the proof of sanctification or election and the leveling of all existence to the glory of God that man might be more fully glorified hereafter.

One can only come to the conclusion that in Rous's own theology and in his own personal life, his bridal mysticism did not weaken his Puritan ethic or narrow it to merely individual emotional concerns. On the contrary, heavenly visitations were productive of "spiritual children" and provided an emotional side to the Puritan ethic that was at times ignored by Rous's contemporaries. He was no innovator in his stressing the emotional aspects of Puritanism, but few contemporaries soared to the height of his emotional fervency and at the same time exhibited such an intense concern for the ethical problems confronting the individual and society.

His was a remarkable balance between Puritanism and mysticism, ethics and emotions, conviction and tolerance, action and contemplation, individual concern and social responsibility.

In light of what has been said in the past two chapters, it is now possible to return to the question regarding the Weber-Troeltsch generalizations on left wing English Puritanism. At least one generalization or illustration of Troeltsch is seriously questioned by this paper. In speaking of the ethic of "spiritual religion" on the English scene Troeltsch said it lacked the "legalistic spirit and the practice of regular discipline" and replaced it with a "self-discipline for the aim of 'deification'."[1] Spiritual religion felt "no need of a moral purification with a supernatural end in view or of a gradual process of sanctification which proves the existence of a state of grace."[2] This was so because its aim was deification, and it used the method of degrees in a life of communion with God.

Troeltsch continues by saying that "this form of spirituality is as remote from the sober and legal spirit of Calvinism and of Puritanism as it is from that of the Anabaptists and the Mennonites."[3] Then he says that "when it did root in Puritanism (as in Dell and Francis Rous) it appealed to Luther and to Catholic literature."[4] Troeltsch would go so far as to say these men belong to the school of Lutheran mysticism, and so differ in kind from the Calvinistic mysticism of men such as Tersteegen.[5] That is a subject in itself and deserves a thorough investigation. He goes on to say that the aim of such "spiritual religion" was "the enjoyment and practical proof of personal salvation;" therefore it was little bound to conventions of men, the moral law of the Bible, and natural law. For this group "it was perfectly natural, therefore, that problems of secular morality, of the State, of Society, and of economics are regarded as unimportant; in fact they are actually treated with entire indifference."[1] After this survey of Rous's ethics, it is unnecessary to prove Troeltsch's generalization inapplicable to Rous and perhaps as future research will show to other Puritan mystics as well.

---

[1] Troeltsch, _op_. _cit_., II, 752.

[2] _Ibid_.

[3] _Ibid_., pp. 752-753.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 753.

[5] _Ibid_.

Troeltsch quotes Ritschl to show that Rous drew upon medieval Catholic mysticism which implies that he would thus differ from Calvin's spirit and from the ethic of Puritanism in its stricter form.[2] Weber, also following Ritschl, looks upon the use of Bernardism in Puritanism as a certain indication of the lack of worldly concern.[3] At that point, "Pietism" differs from Calvinism not only in degree but in kind also.[4] Weber said that deliberate neglect of worldly duties in favor of contemplation "naturally happened with particular frequency when contemplation began to assume the character which Ritschl calls Bernardism, because it suggests St. Bernard's interpretation of the Song of Songs: a mystical, emotional form of religion seeking the unio mystica with an esoteric sexual tinge."[5] It did not "naturally happen" with Rous!

Two things are evidenced by this paper with regards to the above generalizations. First, Troeltsch has placed Rous in the wrong company by linking him with Dell as an example of a certain type of spiritual religion. The description fits Dell partially at best but utterly fails with respect to Rous.[1] That calls forth the second observation, that Troeltsch and Weber did not make sufficient distinctions between spiritualists and mystics with their different theological orientation and consequent sociological significance. Rous definitely was not a spiritualist of the type of Dell, Saltmarsh, Erbury, or even Sir Harry Vane. He was a mystic with a fully intact Puritan ethic.

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., p. 929, n. 12.

[3] See above, p. 2.

[4] Weber, op. cit., p. 241, n. 108. [5] Ibid.

The problem now facing the student of seventeenth century Puritanism is the establishing of a typology broad enough and sufficiently accurate to comprehend the various Puritan thinkers and movements that their place and contributions in their historical era might be correctly evaluated. In one way this thesis hopes to make a small contribution in that direction by establishing the fact that an extremely important Puritan was a mystic, a first-rate mystic at that, who differed in theology and ethics from the spiritualists of his period. Whether he was a solitary individual, a forerunner of a movement, or the source and conveyer of certain tendencies within Puritanism remains to be determined by further research.

It is no longer sufficient to brand a Puritan thinker as neglectful of worldly duties simply because he allegorized the Song of Songs and drew upon such medieval mystics as Bernard, Gerson, and Thomas à Kempis. Furthermore, it is evident that a mystic such as Rous could maintain the bone and marrow of the Puritan ethic while filling out the skeleton with a warmly glowing flesh of pure and consecrated emotions. The question for further research now becomes how many other men of influential position held similar conceptions, and did they fit into the type outlined by Troeltsch?

---

[1] Johnson, op. cit., pp. 72 ff., 76 ff.

## CHAPTER VI

## A MYSTIC AS PARLIAMENTARIAN

Francis Rous did not just write about the action that had to issue from contemplation, but he demonstrated his belief by a life of strenuous Parliamentary activity that continued until he was in his late seventies. The fact that his mysticism proved to be a dynamic for a Puritan ethic is most interesting, but in some ways the immense amount of practical work carried on by this mystic proves even more interesting and even somewhat unexpected. Lord Clarendon in a phrase that shows at once his own prejudice and Rous's tremendous activity called him a man "of a very mean understanding, but thoroughly engaged in the guilt of the times."[1]

One of the questions confronting the student of a mystic Parliamentarian is the relation of his mysticism to his political activity. The Marxist historians would have us believe that religious terminology is but so much camouflage covering the all-pervasive economic motives of many seventeenth century English Parliamentary and Puritan leaders.[2] It cannot be denied that the economic, political, and religious motifs were so inextricably intertwined in most English Puritans that it is often difficult to ascertain which if any was the predominant motif in any one leader. In fairness to historical research and methods, none of the three can be eliminated, but it would do no injustice to the science of history nor to the spirit of the first half of the seventeenth century to say that the world view of the average Puritan leader was more strongly orientated in the direction of religion than in any other direction.

---

[1] Edward Earl of Clarendon, The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, ed., W. D. Mcray (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888), V, 284.

[2] Edward Bernstein, Cromwell and Communism, trans. H. J. Stenning (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1930), pp. 9-10. W. S. Hudson, "Economic and Social Thought of Gerrard Winstanley, Was He a Seventeenth-Century Marxist?" Journal of Modern History, demolishes the theory of treating Winstanley as a pre-Marxist, and he conclusively shows the intimate connexion between Winstanley's theological millinnarianism and his political and economic theories and activities.

Man's relation to God as expressed in theological formulation was more than a "camouflage" to hide economic motives, it was the basic presupposition of the age which gave meaning to all of existence, though it was also influenced by all other phases of life. Thus, one must leave room for the sincerity and importance of the religious views of a seventeenth century Puritan, but at the same time one must realize that other forces were working on religious beliefs as well as being influenced by those same beliefs.

Almost all of Francis Rous's Parliamentary activity centered about religious problems, and it is the contention of this chapter that his attitude towards those problems was largely determined by his mysticism. This is of importance not only as an example of the sociological attitude of a mystic but also as further evidence that men of a mystical and spiritualist tendency were in control of the final attempts at a Church settlement for the English nation during the rule of Cromwell. In order that one might fully understand certain of Rous's actions with regard to Presbyterianism and Independency, a thorough treatment of his religious attitudes and their relation to his practical activity will be undertaken.

Two things are predominant in Rous's religious treatises that are reflected throughout his Parliamentary activity. One was a religious basis tending towards latitude or toleration which never fully developed into religious liberty but was really indicative of an attempt at comprehension that was most fully embodied in the religious establishment under Cromwell. The other was a concern for the ministry and its adequate maintenance in every parish so the Word could be preached in its purity and each congregation could exercise an adequate spiritual discipline. These two concerns reappear time and again throughout all of his tracts and treatises. Both of them are ultimately dependent upon his mystical theology and derive their dynamic from it.

First let us inquire into the relation between theology and toleration. Johannes Kühn indicates five different types of religion and outlines their respective relations to the development of toleration. Neither tolerance nor intolerance are absolute but are relative or relational concepts depending upon certain intellectual and religious attitudes which underly them. Dr. Kühn distinguishes between five types of religious experience in the Reformation era. Prophetic religions of revelation produce intolerance, but other types of religion do not; so, an attitude towards revelation must in some way account for the difference.[1]

In addition to the prophetic type, Herr Kühn finds four other types of religion in the Reformation era. All of these have varying degrees of relation to the idea of toleration. The spiritualist living in the immediate presence of God's Spirit makes a radical distinction between the natural and spiritual realms and maintains that only the latter is of ultimate importance and exists and is preserved solely by spiritual means. Force and external compulsion is of no significance in that realm for there the individual meets God through a spiritual rebirth dependent upon God alone.

---

[1] Kühn, op. cit., pp. 1 ff., 3, 5 f.

The mystic experiences a unity with God in the ground of the soul and emphasizes the necessity of stripping off the impediments of the flesh and the world that through the mystical imitation of the dying and rising Christ he becomes one with him in a bond of love. An objective revelation is replaced by the divine ground in every man. The Tauferische Nachfolge also imitates Christ, but his imitation is a following of the literal historical commands of Christ to their fullest degree of suffering and brotherly love. It is an intense personal relation to God who is seen only in his relation to one's own particular group so committed to him in imitation. The rest of the world can be left alone and is asked only to leave alone. The fourth type might be called rationalistic. It often exhibits a mystical imitation of Christ, but it does not experience the vision or union of the mystics. The all important thing is the noble ethical man following the spiritual dynamic of Jesus who mystically enhances and makes inviting certain basic ethical values; thus while this type stays within a Church because of the necessity of externals, the externals themselves are completely subordinated.[1] Which of these types is the most adequate description of Rous's theology in relation to toleration?

Francis Rous was a Puritan mystic and in certain respects presents difficulties that are not easily resolved with respect to the excellent typology of Herr Kühn. Rous came into mysticism through Puritanism, so the doctrine of the Holy Spirit played a much larger part in his theology than is normally the case with most mystics. Both union with God in Christ through a spiritual marriage and the operation of the Holy Spirit regenerating fallen man and making possible such a union are present in the mysticism of Rous. This combination accounts for his retention of a modicum of necessary historical revelation and the need for the sacraments, Church, and ministry. At the same time, he never objectifies any of them to such an extent that the Spirit is irrevocably bound to them thus giving a firm basis for an intolerant attitude of wide scope. It will be noted later that Rous proposed a number of fundamentals which could never be surrendered, but these were so basic to Christianity, as it was then conceived, that they worked primarily in the direction of toleration.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 15 f., 16 f., 18 ff. Cf. 460 ff., 465 f.

At the basis of Rous's whole conception of toleration or comprehension were the ideas of union with God and the operation of the Spirit. In one short sentence he indicates the result of a believer's union with Christ when he says: "Let true Christians seriously consider, that union in Christ their head is a stronger root of love and unity than lesser differences can be of division." [1] Christ is the saving foundation, and all men knit in union to him are part of one body and one building. This is an obvious adoption of Pauline theology. Christ is united with the Trinity as true God-man, and man united to him is fully surrendered to the "root of Life" and is one with him and with all believers.[2] The object of the work of Christ was to make peace between God and man, and man, being at peace with God, must maintain that peace with other believers as all are called to peace in one body.[3]

In this state of union the saint's heart is formed according to God's heart, "yea, he is a partaker of Divine nature and groweth in it from glory to glory." The fruits of this divine nature are the Pauline virtues of love, joy, peace, longsuffering, and such kindly vigorous affections and relations.[1] Again, expressing this in Johannine terms, Rous states that the saint dwelling in a universal love shows that God, who is love and gives the Spirit of love, dwells in him and he in God. This Johannine ideal has always been a favorite text of the mystics.[2] On this basis Rous can implore "let us not prefer low quarrels and opinions before Christ dwelling and living in his members," because that is to make idols of man's opinions.[3] The really important thing is union with God in Christ.

---

[1] Rous, The Balm of Love: To Heale divisions, and the wounds made by them; and make the Body of Christ whole and entire for its owne beauty, strength, and safety (London: John Wright, 1648), p. 10.

[2] Rous, Treatises, pp. 502, 156.

[3] Ibid., p. 240.

The second theological basis for toleration or comprehension was his insistence upon the importance of the Spirit's operation. The Holy Spirit teaches, draws, and unites only inwardly, though he uses external things through which he works. This Spirit enlightening and sanctifying man makes a true, real, internal, and spiritual unity. He makes a distinction between the men of flesh and men of the Spirit for the latter are "taller" than the former and are enabled to perceive spiritual truths invisible to the fleshly man.[4] Through the Spirit inwardly freeing him while outwardly teaching him, the saint or son of God strives to have "an universal liberty of the soul, free and inclinable to the approving of all Truths, and to the love and practice of all goodness." Having been freed from the fetters of the flesh and fastened to the Spirit, the Son of God obtains the following, says Rous:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 338.

[2] Ibid., p. 341. Rous quotes I Jn. 4: 12- and 1 Jn. 3: 19, 14.

[3] Rous, Balm of Love, p. 13.

[4] Rous, Treatises, pp. 614, 415, 205.

> . . . .a freedom to move wheresoever the Spirit moves, and to love whatsoever the Spirit loves. All Truths are gladly received, all Goodness is highly esteemed, be it in a complexion different, yea contrary.[1]

If the son of God receives a "spiritual eye" with his sonship and sees another son by the same Father how can he but love him? They are one spirit "by being begotten of one Spirit in Christ Jesus," and there is a spiritual likeness as both are created in one image. Rous uses the illustration of a mirror and a man recognizing his likeness in it as an indication of what one son of God beholds when he looks at another. From this likeness "there must needs arise spiritual love and unity." It cannot be the Spirit which leads a so-called Christian to hate or attempt destruction of another Christian for the "Spiritual man" does not act in such a way of the flesh.[2]

It is already clearly evident that union with Christ and the operation of the Spirit are productive only of love, peace, and unity with other Christian brethren. God is love, and if there is no love in a saint there is no life in Jesus Christ. He made love the work of his true disciples, and without it, the divine nature is not in man who then becomes but a tinkling cymbal.[3] Rous emphatically states that if "faith work not downward in our hearts by Love, it works not upward into union with our Head Christ Jesus." But if the Spirit is truly followed then man is in love "yea, he is in love with love."[4]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 203.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 338; Rous, *Balm of Love*, pp. 2, 13.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 2 ff., 9 ff.

[4] Rous, *Treatises*, pp. 209, 214.

This love is not vague sentimentality or general cheerfulness born of man's natural disposition. It is a product of God's working in man and issues in concrete activity. On the one hand it is evidenced in the way man follows truth because the saint will follow truth only in love and not in malice and hatred.[1] On the other hand it tends to produce peace and strength in the Church. "True Christian love will not be solitary, and fruitlesse; but it must bring forth peace, and be attended by it." Love is the fruit of the Spirit, and peace is the fruit of love which attends love as a daughter serving as a midwife to bring forth the other fruitfulness of love.

Again Rous uses the symbol of offspring to show the relation between religious beliefs and practical activity. Here it is most quaint in that peace is the eldest daughter of love and delivers the rest of the children and "without her help the mother doth nothing but make abortions."[2] To modern taste this is a peculiar way to say that whatever the results of the dynamic of love, they will be utterly lost to the Church unless they are enacted in peace rather than in vengence or malice. But the metaphor leaves no doubt as to the relation between the two virtues and the consequences of the absence of either, and it is perfectly in keeping with the literary standards of his day. In some sense love is the source of all other Christian virtues and does often fail to achieve its direction because certain offspring or results are not present to speed its endeavors. The important thing is that the body of Christ edifies itself only in love and its products; therefore, no love, no edification.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

[2] Rous, *Balm of Love*, p. 4.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

But the sad fact is that many things are present to thwart the love which should produce unity among the saints. Rous is a keen observer of human life and the difficulties faced by religious convictions. Though he can extoll eloquently the virtues of union in Christ and the possession of his Spirit, Rous knows that no man reaches perfection in this life but always remains a struggling saint. The sinner in him may be somewhat subdued but the dreadful struggle continues. There is tremendous opposition to the operation of love and peace in the Church, and Rous intends to warn the saints.

First, there is nature itself which makes its claim through a man's entire background of family, nation, physical environment, and total cultural influence. Man has a natural inclination towards religion, and when this is fostered by birth and education it is often mistaken for grace and becomes a strongly opinionated "hating all Religions different or opposite." Religion held merely by custom is not sufficient, and even "if thou holdest thy Religion because thou art accustomed to it, for Carnal Reasons, and by a common hand, thou holdest not Religion truly: yea though thou hold the true Religion." Man can receive the elements and rudiments of religion by birth or education, but the inward man receives them only "by Heavenly inspiration." God is a Spirit and the only religion which pleases him is spiritual and truthful. The Church then has these two types of people in it: men of natural apprehension and men of spiritual discernment.[1]

The second thing that hinders love and peace is man's "complexion" or "humor," or what we would call his disposition or temperament. He divides men into three types of destructive temperaments: the "choleric" or acid-like, the "phlegmatick" or over-retiring, and the "melencholic" or extremely ascetic. Especially interesting is his treatment of the latter whom he upbraids for exhibiting too sour a countenance, for being too querulous concerning certain corruptions, and for hating forms to such a degree that he wants religion as a pure substance or as a soul without a body and wants the Church to be like himself. All three are guilty of attacking each other and claiming religion exclusively for their particular positions while in reality it is only "Humor that fights with Humour, Complexion with Complexion, and Flesh with Flesh."[1]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 194, 195, 196, 192 ff. Cf., p. 314.

Finally, zeal often outruns discretion and destroys peace so love cannot express itself. Rous feels that even when a zealous saint is reproving a sinner he must not be indiscreet in his actions or hateful towards the sinner. His object is the salvation of the sinner and destruction of the sin. The kindly heat of the fire of the Spirit is love not contention, but when the heat grows contentous, it is no longer spiritual. In an expression that rings true to most modern ears Rous says that "malice sometimes rayleth in Scripture Phrases, and beateth his Enemies with Divinity; and thinks it may speak what it will, so it be in the words in Scripture. . .. ." He wants new born sons of the Spirit to lay aside all such contention and malice based on education, temperament, or lack of discretionary zeal, so the Christian can express "the true Virtues of a godly Nature, received with the new man, even Charity, Peace, and Unity."[2]

Having seen the necessity for love and peace among Christian brethren yet also having seen the opposition offered to it, one wonders exactly what is to be the extent of the operation of unity, love, and peace. Rous feels that it should embrace members of all Churches everywhere and that it should try to become a visible fellowship in love and peace. As we proceed we will note statements that sound familiar to contemporary ecumenically minded Christians. Answering a Roman Catholic objection that the visible and invisible churches are not recognized as one by Protestants and that all emphasis is placed upon the oneness of the invisible Church, Rous replies: "But who denies this? yea, who denies the true Church on earth to be but one? and this is the Protestants main business to keep it one, though differing in some lesser points of doctrine. . . . ."[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*., pp. 197-200.

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 97, 207-209, 518-519, 210, 213 f., 214 f.

The Christian must set no bounds or limits to his love or peace because what God has sanctified and made fit for our peace we must welcome. The extent can be no less than the unity and operation of the Spirit, and if God has not withheld his Spirit from certain men then Christians dare not withhold their love and peace or they will be denying the Spirit that is in such a man. That being the case, "our affections must be enlarged and made capable of the whole world," and the Christian cannot have a "narrow love contracted and confined to the measure of one City, Kingdome, or Nation." The Christian is to have love and peace "with a beeliving Muscovite, Grecian, Ethiopian, Indian, if he be of that one body wherein Christ is all in all," for they too are part of the "remmant according to the election of grace," part of the "true Israel" the pure in heart "those who in Christ Jesus are new creatures." That only is the true Catholic Church which is endowed with a universal love, and such a loving Church is a truly living

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 386.

Church.[1]

One passage of Rous deserves quotation in extenso because it is indicative of his spirit and interest. In it he states:

> Let no man therefore say of another, He is of such a Nation with which my Nation is at enmity, or of such a Church which professeth some differences with the Church in which I live, and therefore I will by no means have love and peace with him; but remember, that in every Nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of God. . . . .[2]

The love and peace of the saints extends, then, even to those in different Churches who are infected with errors. This is not to say that Rous glossed over doctrinal errors or was indifferent to them. On the contrary he warned that one must be careful not to be infected by such errors and should be fully aware of them; however, one must be careful not to hate the Spirit of Christ in any man. Furthermore, when only minor external errors are involved then the internal unity of the Spirit is such a greater bond of love that the believer dare not press divisions or hatreds. Through all of this he kept one other idea in the foreground--while pursuing unity of charity do not lose saving verity. Man must be careful on two fronts.[3]

Rous put the very widest possible bounds to charity and love though he was always careful of not condoning error. As a result, he could claim that he belonged to no sect, but "the truth is, he is only of the Sect of Truth and Goodness; and that is no Sect. For these he approves wheresoever he finds them, in what Complexion, Religion, or Nation soever. . . . ." Such a man attempts to stand strong in the path of the Spirit which is on no side but "in the midst," and he turns neither to the right nor the left though terrors strike on both sides.[1] But there is a price to pay says Rous:

---

[1] Rous, Balm of Love, pp. 5, 6, 8, 9.

[2] Ibid., p. 7.

[3] Ibid., p. 12. Cf., Rous, Treatises, pp. 560, 341, 407.

> For the spiritual being of no faction, nor severalty, but affecting universal goodness, serves himself of the goodness of each Complexion, and refuseth the vices and extremities of it. So by reason of his different temper from all, he hath Enemies of all, being _Virtus in medio vitorum_.[2]

The extent to which Rous was willing to project love in peace is indicated by his attitude towards the Roman Catholic Church. While most Protestants admitted that there were a few Christians in the Roman communion, few of them ever mentioned it in their treatises. There is no evidence available in this country to determine Rous's practical treatment of Roman Catholics, but it is certain that he detested popery with the vehemence of any good Puritan. However, on the other hand, he never tired of reiterating that there were Catholics who were members of the Christian Church and also deserved one's love.

He abhorred the supremacy and the as yet undefined infallibility of the pope. He was repelled by the Roman Catholic use of force and bloodshed to procure uniformity and he felt that the Romans, led by the Jesuits, preached traitorious doctrines and were not to be trusted in England. That was the basis for their exclusion from toleration. Within the Roman faith itself there were two major types of religion, the "Curial religion" of the Court and the so-called "Theological religion" which is taught by their divines and acknowledged for the saving of souls. The latter contains four types: crass doctrinal religion depending on merits, image worship, and superstition; limited doctrine on a certain interpretation of Scriptures; spiritual doctrine concerned with the conscience; and the doctrine for the common people. Among the third type are men taught by the Spirit of God and so enforced by the light of their consciences that they depend wholly on the mercy of God and merits of Christ. Such men as Bernard, Thomas á Kempis and Stephen Gardiner, sanctified and taught by the Spirit, form a small Church within the Roman Church, and those men whenever found and wherever found are to receive love and peace.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 204, 206-207.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 206.

Two of the primary reasons for this very tolerant attitude of Rous were the ideas that man can only know in part during this life and that different men are at different levels of knowledge depending upon how far the Spirit of God has led them or how close their union to Christ is. This was expressed by Rous in several places. Every believer should be given certain "graines" of allowance because Scripture plainly says that in this life we know but in part. This prevents one of greater knowledge from being proud over a member of lesser knowledge or from making the difference a ground of disagreement leading to hatred. Scripture is plain in indicating the incompleteness of man's knowledge and in commanding love to the brethren, but nowhere does it enjoin hatred because of a lesser degree of knowledge in some.[2]

Each man should walk in the measure of truth to which he attains and not make his level the measure of all other men. If one has not attained to certain things let him wait "with mutuall patience and forbearance untill the same be revealed." Man should learn to judge correctly what he has and strive to increase his love, but he should be careful not to go beyond his gift either in condemning that which he cannot apprehend or approving that which he cannot attain or understand. The grace of God is manifold and diverse, let not man despise it in any of its operations. There are different gifts to different members of the body and each member plays its part. Note again the influence of Paul.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 346, 141-142, 247, 416, 249, 434, 465, 142 f., 144.

[2] _Ibid_., pp. 503 f.; Rous, _Balm of Love_, pp. 10-11.

The main thing is for the believer to be what Christ wants him to be. When Christ says follow me, it is not our place to argue about another's way for Christ will surely say, "What is that to thee? follow thou me." The full blown idea of love and peace is seen in operation where Rous says that "it is the Masters part to allot the way and worke of his Disciples; and therefore let both Peter and John walke their different way, to which their Master hath differently directed them."[2]

In addition to the fact that believers were to bear with one another in love and unity, they were not to oppose each other or any doctrinal error with the use of force. Rous says that "religion is busied about excellent things, as union with God, conformity to God, and persecution and opposition comes from Irreligion Atheism, and Malice." Christianity dare not use temporal force for spiritual problems for Christ's kingdom is not of this world. The Christian's weapons are spiritual and not carnal, and the Spirit makes sheep and not wolves. Whoever delights in blood for conscience sake is a "Lamb of Anti-Christ," a wolf in the Church ravishing the flock of Christ.[3] Even when the Christian cannot extend the right hand of fellowship he dare not extend the hand with a sword.

Throughout this discussion of the necessity for love and peace among the saints or believers, frequent reference has been made to the saints as those who agreed in certain fundamentals. Toleration was urged on the basis of unity in essentials and forbearance in matters not absolutely necessary to salvation.[1] The question now presses, what were the fundamentals? Needless to say, they were basic and sufficiently broad to embrace almost all sincere professing Christians in Rous's day. Unity was not to be reckoned by smaller points but by basic principles. Rous said the object of the Protestants as over against the papists was to save many thousand souls "who by faith in Christ the foundation are united into God; and by repentance and regeneration do strive and endeavour to obey him." The Christian, then, through union with Christ attempts to grow up unto Christ in love.[2]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, pp. 140, 103. Rous, Heavenly Academie, pp. 166-178.

[2] Ibid., p. 177.

[3] Rous, Treatises, pp. 116, 164, 195, 528.

The fundamentals are simple for Rous and are "plain without controversie," simply "to know God and Jesus Christ by a true faith unto justification and sanctification is life eternal." Of course such faith is always understood as that which unites to Christ. He continually returns to this idea as the primary and fundamental tenet of Christianity.[3]

Rous did have some conception of an historical revelation, but it was so basic that hardly any professing Christian could reject it. But the interesting fact is that he did not depend solely on the eelation of the Spirit to each individual entirely apart from a specific, concrete, historical revelation which in a certain way was valid for all times and for all believers. Rous went so far as to avow the three creeds and first four councils,[4] but his real creed can be expressed in the following passage: "A first, that certainly so much be known and believed of God in Christ Jesus, as may unite us to him, and so make us partakers of his death and resurrection unto remission of sins and regeneration: and therefore ordinarily his Incarnation, Death and Resurrection are certainly to be known and believed."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 502.

[2] Ibid., pp. 427, 462, 522.

[3] Ibid., pp. 598, 209, 375, 116, 445.

[4] Ibid., p. 367. Cf., ibid., pp. 436-437.

So, it is clear that in his religious treatises Rous gave expression to ideas that pointed in the direction of at least a limited toleration. But that was only one of the interests that was to receive expression in his Parliamentary activity. The other emphasis that appeared in his first treatise and constantly reappeared in his numerous writings was a concern for a consecrated, decently paid minister for every English parish.

Rous held an extremely high view of the ministry as established _jure divino._ He first expressed this as early as 1616 when he spoke of them as messengers and ambassadors of Christ and said that the Lord was the founder of the ministry. Ministers were "God's Colony on earth," the "Successor of Christ," "a Factor for the King of heaven" whose business was to return souls to the kingdom of heaven.[2] In the course of debates and speeches concerning religion in Charles' second Parliament of 1640 Rous said the "ministers are certainly _Jure divino_; bishops doubtful but archbishops certeynly not; and moved that those which were not _Jure divino_ should not silence those that were _Jure Divino_ and desired that the Petition might be committed."[3] Rous never expressed himself as to the necessity of elders and the rest of the Presbyterian system, but it seems certain from his general statements and from his overall activities that he never considered the system as _jure_ divino.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 444.

[2] _Ibid_., pp. 563 ff.

[3] Wallace Notestein (ed.), _The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes From the Beginning of the Long Parliament To the Opening of the Trial of the Earl of Strafford_ (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923), p. 531.

Never one to absolutize anything relative, Francis Rous viewed the high conception of the office as wholly dependent upon God. It is most true that God uses the service of ministers and the Church to "publish" the articles of faith, but there is no other foundation of supernatural faith than God himself who speaks "by man to man," so "the fundamentality of our faith passeth through man that is the instrument, and resteth wholly upon God."[1]

Two other problems which bothered Rous were the general scorn for the ministry by noble families and the lack of adequate maintenance of ministers. He urges the nobility to give of their sons to the service of the Lord. But the most pressing problem was that of maintenance, there being many churches "like Lamps without light, the oyl of maintenance being taken from them." He appeals to law and to private consciences to remedy the situation. At the time of the Reformation it was the law of king and Parliament that condoned the stripping of the Church's adequate parish maintenance, so now in an enlightened age law should remedy matters. If Parliament could raise huge sums for purely temporal ends, it should certainly be able to raise funds for the Church either by regaining part of the ancient inheritance of the Church or by procuring some new means of augmentation. It will be seen later that Rous was a key member in all Parliamentary committees dealing with these problems.[2]

Where law fails to provide for these matters, as it did for a number of years, Rous encourages men of substance to remedy the situation in their own parishes. He pleads with those men of position, who have in their possession the patronage of a benefice, freely to appoint good preachers and worthy pastors. He inveighs against all traffic in advowsons and warns men not to use them as legal cloaks to cover their avarice in robbing the Church of God. Finally, he upbraids the common people for trying to cheat their pastors out of their rightful tithe.[1]

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 447.

[2] Ibid., pp. 563 ff.

In opposition to most of the left wing Puritans such as Dell, Erbury, or Harrison, Rous believed in the necessity of tithes. He could see no other present means to maintain an adequate ministry in each parish. It was on this point that he as Speaker of Barebones Parliament, in conjunction with other men, surrendered the power back to Cromwell. "For the maintenance of the Ministry, Tithes are allowed; for the Place, the Church; and for the Time, the Lord's Day." Those in addition to the preached Word, the sacraments, and local discipline were the absolute necessities for Rous.[2] Throughout his entire Parliamentary career, whether cooperating with Presbyterians or Independents or working on committees of Parliament, he never surrendered his interest in these essentials for the parish ministry. These interests taken in concert with his sincere interest in comprehension and a limited toleration form the background in light of which his Parliamentary activities are made intelligible.

## II

To outline all of Francis Rous's Parliamentary activity against the total background of his era would be a thesis in itself; however, the part he played in certain leading questions of the day will be treated in relation to his mystical theology. There are at least three important matters that might seem contradictory. His violent attacks on Arminianism and the papacy seem entirely out of keeping with his profession of love for all the saints in all parties. Furthermore, his close cooperation with the Presbyterian party also raises questions about his views on comprehension or toleration. Then finally, his shift from Presbyterianism to Independency (if heever made one), raises certain questions as to his consistency. The contention of this chapter is that his actions in all of the above cases were not contradictions of but the results of his religious attitudes.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 567-572.

[2] Ibid., pp. 240 f.

Charles' third Parliament of 1628-29 was the first time that Rous played a conspicuous part in public affairs. Parliament had been prorogued June 26, 1628 when the Commons in their attacks upon Arminianism, Popery, and illegal exaction of money, began to take vengeance upon certain prelates and advisors of Charles and moved ever closer to his favorite councilors, Laud and Buckingham. Parliament was reconvened in January 1629 that it might give immediate attention to the crown's desperate need for funds; however, Commons first turned to grievances, and Rous opened the attack on Arminianism and Popery.

Just as ship-money was the point at which lawyers and gentry accused the king of subverting the constitutional customs of the nation so Arminianism was attacked as an innovation of the established religion of the nation. Theologically the term was applied to men such as Laud and Andrewes because they denied predestination and stood for the diocesan episcopate as divinely ordained and of the _esse_ of the Church. Liturgically it was supposedly represented by such men as Dr. Cosin who in his _Book of Devotions_ of 1627 added much of aesthetic value to the Anglican Church year and worship service. That, in conjunction with other so-called ceremonial innovations, convinced both Puritans and moderate Anglicans that the Arminian clergy were moving towards Rome.[1] But worst of all were the sermons of such men as Montague, Sibthorpe, and Manwaring who appealed to royal prerogative to protect the Church as they conceived it, and they in return would defend the divine right and sole leadership of the crown. King and convocation were to constitute the sole religious authorities and enforce their decisions upon people of England as the Church of England.[2]

During the 1628 session of Parliament the Commons had attacked the growing boldness of the Arminian clergy and their complete cooperation with the crown against the time honored practises of people and Church. It is extremely interesting to note the inseparable connection between politics and religion in this quarrel. It was the one great factor that was later to prevent Charles from any plausible compromise with either the Scottish or the English Presbyterians and ultimately cost him his life. After the Commons had inveighed against Montague, Manwaring, and Cosin they carried up charges against some of them and expected the king to see that fit punishment was meted out. Between the proroguing of the Parliament in 1628 and its reconvening in January of 1629, Charles had bestowed favors on every divine that Parliament had attacked. Montague was made bishop of Chichester, Manwaring was pardoned on the grounds that he recanted the most objectionable part of his opinions, and Charles gave him Stanford Rivers, one of the richest livings in the king's hands. Meanwhile, Laud had been promoted ~~to~~ the bishopric of London, a staunch Puritan stronghold. In every case these men were either strongly suspect by Parliament or were actually marked as unfit for further preferment.[1]

---

[1] Godfrey Davis, "Arminian versus Puritan in England ca., 1620-1640," *The Huntington Library Bulletin*, V (April, 1934), 157-179.

[2] Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England From the Ascension of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War* (London: Longmans: Green, and Co., 1891), VI, 203-210; VII, 9-12.

Little wonder that when Parliament reassembled in January of 1629, it was in no mood to follow Charles's wishes and vote a bill of tunnage and poundage before grievances were redressed. After Secretary Coke read a message from the king to Commons and offered to bring in a bill such as Charles desired, he was told that it was not the custom of the House to vote on a bill of supply except upon resolutions debated in committees of the House. Instead, the House "resolved to proceed in the next place with matters of Religion, and particularily against the Sect of Arminians. Upon which occasion Mr. Rouse spoke to this purpose."[2]

Rous spoke with great vehemence and fervency as he assailed Arminianism as "an Error that makes the grace of God Lackey it after the will of Man; that makes Sheep to keep the Shepherd, and makes a mortal seed of an immortal God." He wished the House to look into the "very belly and bowels of this Trojan Horse, to see if there be not in it men ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny and Spanish monarchy."[3] Here is clearly shown the real reason why most men feared so-called Arminianism. It appeared to present a movement back to Rome both theologically and liturgically and its supporters were always closely connedted with a foreign policy that seemed detrimental to England. Two main groups upheld the doctrine of free will, the Roman Catholics and the Arminians, and were of danger to England.[1]

---

[1] S. R. Gardiner, The Personal Government of Charles I, 1628-1637 (London: Longman's Green and Co., 1877), I, 62 ff.

[2] John Rushworth, Historical Collections of Private Passages of State. . . . . 1618. . . .1648 . . . . (London: D. Browne et. al., 1721-1722), I, 645.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, 645-646.

The Puritans continually referred to the experience of their brethren in Holland. Arminianism crept into the Lowlands and divided the nation just at the time when it was attempting to revive from years of Spanish Catholic persecution and to procure a final settlement of its harn won victory. Not only did it appear similar to Romanism in its doctrine of free will, but it also seemed to favor Catholicism by its political activities. Rous said:

> And if ye mark it well, you shall see an Arminian reaching out his hand to a papist; a Papist to a Jesuit, a Jesuit gives one hand to the Pope, and the other hand to the king of Spain: and these men having kindled a fire in our neighbours country, have now brought over some of it hither to set on flame this kingdom also.[2]

John Pym, the step-brother of Rous,[3] followed by upholding the right of Parliament in establishing true religion and punishing false. Eliot also repudiated the bishop's and clergy's sole claims to establish and control the religion of the people of England. This was a basic issue that was to plague the religious settlement of the English nation up to the present day. Laud and his group claimed the bishops and Church in Convocation had sole right to control the religious establishment subject only to the Crown. They illustrated this by the content of the famous Declaration of

---

[1] Rous, Testis Veritatis. Rous wrote this against Montague's Apello Caesarem, of 1625, to prove that such doctrines as Montague's were a distortion of England's religion and theology and were at one with the Jesuits who advocated free-will.

[2] William Cobbett (ed.), Parliamentary History of England Comprising the Period From the Accession of Charles I, in March 1625, To the Battle of Edge-Hill, in October 1642 (London: T.C. Hansard, 1807), II, 444-445. W. Notestein and F.H.Relf (eds.), The Common Debates for 1629, Critically Edited (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1921), pp. 12-14. Rushworth, op. cit., I, 645-646; Rous, Testis Veritatis, p. 106.

[3] S. R. Brett, John Pym, 1583-1643 (London: John Murry, 1940), p. xxi. When Pym entered Middle Temple, Francis Rous was one of the surities entered in his behalf.

1628 drawn up by Laud and his associates and ordered by Charles to be appended to the Prayer Book. Charles readily assented to their view and acted accordingly in offering preferment to men whom the Parliament had disqualified from further advancements. The Parliament claimed that it had acted in conjunction with crown and Church in establishing and maintaining religion in England and was not to be left completely out of contact with the propagation of religion in England. The question was not only one of religious convictions, but it was also a question of Parliament's rights.

For the remainder of the 1629 Parliament Rous was in the thick of the discussions about Arminianism and Popery, and he even proposed that the House should enter a covenant to protect the nation against them; and the House undertook such a declaration on January 29, 1629.[1] It was completely opposed to the government of the Church as undertaken by a few bishops and the king as was illustrated by their recent publication , the disputed Declaration. On the tenth of March, Parliament was dismissed, but not before they had thoroughly discussed the maneuvers of the Arminian clergy, resolved to oppose them, and passed three famous resolutions against innovations in religion and illegal levying of tunnage and poundage.[2]

From the dissolution of Parliament until the calling of the Short Parliament in 1640 there was a period of eleven years personal rule by Charles and his advisors. Briefly put, it was a struggle of the king to rule supreme in the ecclesiastical and political spheres with no interference from an unruly Parliament.

---

[1] Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I, 1625-49, Vol. III, (1628-29) (London: Longman, Brown et. al, 1859), p. 458.

[2] Rushworth, op. cit., I, 648 ff.; Notestein and Relf, op. cit., passim.

Religious affairs were in the hands of Laud who continued to press uniformity in all points of the nation's religious life. He was made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 and reissued the Book of Sports the same year. In his hands the Court of High Commission became a potent force of coercion to enforce Laud's program. The Arminian clergy were favored in preference and in opportunities to publish their views while the Puritan divines were largely kept from both. It was the attempt of Laud and Charles to force their program of uniformity on Scotland that brought about the so-called Bishops Wars of 1638 and 1640 which necessitated the calling of the two Parliaments of 1640.

The Short Parliament met in April of 1640 but was dissolved at the end of a three weeks period. Before it was disbanded, it succeeded in voicing the rising discontent of the people in matters ecclesiastical and political. As before, Rous was in the foreground with his attacks on Arminianism and Papacy and his claim that "the root of all our grievences" is "an intended union between us and Rome." He speaks of the many books of English Churchmen trying to show the similarity between the doctrine of the English Church and that of Rome, and he claims that Rome answers these men of the English Church in a book such as Sancta Clare's Deus, Natura, Gratia. To accomplish their end the word Puritan is placed on all good men of religious conviction, and the attempt is made to shame them out of religion. In a conclusion, he connects all these religious evils together with the attempt to deprive men of their goods and liberties; so, at the "root of the whole matter" is religion.[1]

After Parliament was dissolved, Convocation under Laud continued to sit and voted the king a subsidy for the next six years, passed a series of canons and drew up the notorious "Et Cetera Oath."[1] Laud was opposed to Convocation sitting after Parliament dissolved but Charles had his way. This was to become one of the basic points of contention during the Long Parliament. The first Bishops' War ended with the pacification of Berwick in 1639, but when the second war opened and the Scots entered northern England, the King was powerless to stop them. While the Scottish army occupied Northumberland and Durham to insure performance of the treaty of Ripon in 1640, the King was forced to call Parliament once again. Possessing a good example and a potent weapon in the presence of the Scottish army on English soil, the Parliament for the first time actually held the upper hand.[2]

---

[1] Cal. S.P. Domestic, 1641, XVI, 37-29.

The Parliament which met in November, 1640, was to remain until King and Church had been overthrown. It is difficult in a short chapter such as this to convey an impression of the tremendous change which was wrought. Certainly the new Parliament was of a different spirit than the previous one. Embodying a new spirit of confidence, the Long Parliament quickly set out to attack the culminated abuses of "personal rule." Also the House immediately sat as the Grand Committee on Religion to consider abuses in the Church. Furthermore, they at once appointed the Committee for Privileges. Rous was a member of the latter, and also sat on a select committee to inquire into the profanation and rejection of the sacrament.[1]

---

[1] The greatly disputed canons of 1640 were particularly obnoxious to the Puritans because of two reasons. First, they had been passed in Convocation after the "Short Parliament" had been dissolved. Though these canons were partially directed against papists, their real direction was against Puritanism and the sectaries. By ingenious construction, statutes intended for suppression of popery were turned against Protestants. Furthermore, the first canon claimed unbridled divine right of kings and completely ignored Parliamentary rights or pretentions. Secondly, the canons contained an oath to be administered to all men in orders--the famous et cetera oath. It approved of the doctrine and discipline of government of the Church of England as containing all things necessary to salvation and denied the right of any to alter said government by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons et cetera, as it was then established. Such an oath was begging the question of the hour by giving a blanket approval to every jot and title of the Anglican system while completely denying the right to consider change at any point. It was unfortunate that the phrase et cetera was placed in the oath, but even without it, the Puritans could not have accepted the discipline of the Church as containing all things necessary to salvation.

[2] W. S. Hudson, "The Scottish Effort to Presbyterianize the Church of England During the Early Months of the Long Parliament," Church History, VIII (September, 1939), 255-282.

But before mentioning a few of the many important committees on which Rous served it would be well to speak of some of his more important work on the floor of the House of Commons. As Parliament went about a rather unplanned program of attack on ecclesiastical abuse, investigation of the ship-money cases, and attacks on the advisors of Charles, the city of London was busily at work preparing a violent petition for Church reform and abolition of Episcopacy. The Root and Branch Petition was presented December 11, 1640 and at once introduced a split in the heretofore united Parliamentary front; however, Commons decided to take it into consideration on the seventeenth.

When that day arrived Parliament found it was too busy with other matters, the question was too dangerous for discussion. But when Rous got up and spoke against the late canons and Et Cetera Oath and "moved their legality," the House fell in with his motion and proceeded to a brisk debate.[2] Within a few days Commons voted that the Canons were illegal and bound neither clergy nor laity.[3] Sir Simonds D'Ewes said that when Rous first attacked the legality of the canons and oath "he therefore desired that we might enquire who weere the main contrivers of these wicked Canons and censure them deeplie."[1] Laud was undoubtedly the man sought and a few days later, at Pym's motion, the Archbishop was impeached. In the early days of Parliament Rous seemed to be interested primarily in reform of the abuses in the Church and worked closely with his brother-in-law, the acknowledged leader of Parliament, John Pym. In the spring, March 1641, Rous carried up to the Lords articles of impeachment against the aforementioned Dr. Cosins.[2] Later that address was published, and it gives in summary Rous's attitude towards Arminianism and Popery and their danger to England.[3] This work was the outcome of investigations by a committee, of which Rous was a member, to examine the complaints and petitions of the oppressed and annoyed ministers.[4]

---

[1] Great Britain, The Journal of the House of Commons, 1640, II, 21, 24. Hereafter referred to as C.J.

[2] Notestein, D'Ewes Journal, p. 125.

[3] Gardiner, History of England, IX, 248.

At this point one might pause to determine the relation between Rous's theological professions and his activity against Laud, Cosins, Manwaring, and other so-called Arminians. In view of what he said about toleration and love to all brethren are his actions inconsistent or insincere? The latter is certainly not the case, and the former is most doubtful. It is to be kept in mind that Rous in 1641 wrote his treatise Catholicke Charity, which contained as a first chapter the later reproduced Balm of Love.[5] That treatise more than any other embodied the loftiest sentiments on comprehension and love to all saints. One might say that Rous did not consider so-called Arminians as holding to the fundamentals of faith, and so they did not deserve his toleration. But one would be hard pressed to prove that Rous held predestination as an absolute fundamental before the hand of fellowship could be extended. Throughout his career he worked with men who were not as thoroughgoing predestinarians as he was. Rather, one could say that the Arminians such as Laud could not be extended the love and toleration of the saints because of three reasons.

---

[1] Notestein, D'Ewes Journal, p. 125.

[2] Notestein, D'Ewes Journal, pp. 437, 471, 492; Rushworth, op. cit., IV, 208-210.

[3] Rous, A Speech Made Before the Lords In the Vpper House Against Dr. Cossens, Dr. Maynwaring, and Mr. Beale; Upon the Complaint of Mr. Peter Smart (London: John Wright, 1641).

[4] Notestein, D'Ewes Journal, p. 259. [5] See Appendix A.

First, they prevented such a thing themselves by attempting to force a uniformity and unity upon all Christians in England through the use of illegal methods such as High Commission, Star Chamber, the abominable Et Cetera Oath, and other such unspiritual weapons.[1] Their only test of sincerity seemed to be forced subscription to external oaths. Men could bear with them to a certain point, but when they punished believers for being zealous, that was going too far. The same thing which drove Baxter out of the Laudian Church seemed to operate earlier in the case of Rous.[2]

---

[1] The Court of High Commission developed out of commissioners appointed by Elizabeth to administer the operation of the Act of Supremacy. Though Henry VIII had also appointed such officers, it was under Elizabeth that their activities were so expanded that they assumed a place similar to that of a court of the privy council. But under James I and Charles I, this court, having bishops sitting on it, extended its powers to imprison and fine the laity and clergy for so-called ecclesiastical abuses. The Court became one of the primary means to oppress Puritanism, to censor the press, and to enforce Laudian uniformity. The other half of the "thorough" rule was the Star Chamber, another court of the privy council. Both of these courts bypassed the normal rights of English subjects and functioned in an arbitrary way to enforce the Crown's peace and policy. Though Laud often complained of its lack of speed, it was a most efficient instrument to suppress criticism of Crown and hierarchy. Leighton and Prynn experienced its cruel injustices. Little wonder that the Puritans hated these two engines of uniformity. Puritan and Common Lawyer made common cause in opposing these dubiously legal instruments.

[2] Richard Baxter, Reliquiae Baxterianae. . . . .(London: T. Parkhurst, F. Robinson, F. Lawrence, and J. Dunton, 1696), p. 17. "For now our drowsie mindlesness of that subject was shaken off by their violence; and we that thought it best to follow our business,

Even as late as 1640 Rous did not seem to be seeking any more than most moderate reformers, a clearing of the abuses in the Church. Until certain abuses were corrected, it was of little avail to offer the hand of love when it was certain to be slapped unless it wore the glove of Arminianism and royal prerogative.

Because of the actions of the bishops and clergy such as Cosins, Manwaring, and Laud, Rous as a Parliamentarian had to attack them. They were pursuing a policy of the Convocation and Crown ruling the Church entirely apart from Parliament. Following Pym, he believed this to be a subversion of former practices in the Church. History has never decided which side was correct, and scholars are still arguing the problem in light of the precedents of the English Reformation, so Rous can hardly be denied the right to act as a Parliamentarian on the side which he believed correct. The important thing is that the Laudians set their own terms for the bond of fellowship accompanied by threats of force and made it almost impossible for any sort of comprehension to be practiced among believers. At least that is the way things appeared to Rous.

Thirdly, Rous honestly believed as did many intelligent Englishmen of his day, that these bishops, demanding the English diocesan episcopacy as _jure divino_ and introducing by compulsion many liturgical practices which heretofore were things indifferent or at least uninforced, seemed to be leading the Church back to Rome. He feared that some of the Arminians had conferences with Roman Catholics such as Sancta Clara, and pointed out that Laud himself said that it would be no hard matter to make reconciliation if a wise man were to handle it. Little did Rous know what a staunch

---

and to live in quietness, and let the Bishops alone, were rowzed by the terrours of an Oath to look about us, and understand what we did."

Protestant Laud was, but to all appearances this talk about similarity with Rome meant a movement towards the Papacy. But, said Rous, there can be no reconciliation without loss of English religion because the Pope is "fastened to his Errors, even by his Chaire of Inerrabilitie," and the two cannot meet unless they go wholly to him.[1] That is exactly where Rous drew the line. One could have love and fellowship with Roman Catholics who depended only on the mercy of God and lived His love, but Rous was utterly opposed to Romanism as a religion demanding obedience to that which the Pope claims is the substance of religion. That was to make submission to the judgments of human beings more important than union with Christ Jesus and rebirth by the Holy Spirit. So, it appears that Rous, when he made his attacks on the so-called Arminians, was not contradicting his statements about the relation of love between Christian brethren. He could do nothing else if he was to be faithful to his conception of religion. Later, as the chief trier on the famous Board of Triers for approval of ministers he was to allow men of Episcopal sentiment to serve as pastors if their loyalty to the Commonwealth was assured.[2]

The other point at which the activity of Rous puzzles the student of his mystical theology is his support of the Presbyterian party until 1648, and then, his warm support of Cromwell after that date. This can be understood only in light of the total background of his activity in behalf of a certain type of religious settlement to replace Episcopacy. The House sitting as the Grand Committee of Religion every Saturday and Monday, appointed a number of sub-committees to handle various important religious questions. Rous's name, beginning with the Committee for Scandalous Ministers, appeared on every important religious committee appointed by Commons.[1] Especially important was the Committee on Preaching Ministers to consider the lack of preachers and means of maintenance for those who need help.[2]

---

[1] Rous, Speech Before Lords, 1640, p. 3.

[2] Henry A. Glass, The Barebone Parliament (London: James Clarke and Co., 1899), p. 19.

The period from 1641-1650 was a period of tremendous activity for Francis Rous. His work on the Plundered Ministers Committee[3] and numerous other religious committees, his activity as a lay assessor in the Westminister Assembly and go-between for the two Houses and for the Assembly and Commons, placed a heavy responsibility upon him. His name occurs hundreds of times in the Commons Journals.[4] Early in 1644 he was made provost of Eaton College at Oxford on condition that he would not give up his seat in Parliament.[5] But in this chapter we are particularly interested in his activity in the Westminster Assembly and his relation to the Presbyterian party. Without a doubt Rous was cooperating with the Presbyterian party from 1643 until at least 1646. This raises questions with regard to his statements concerning religious comprehension, for certainly no party was more opposed to even a mild toleration than was the Presbyterian party.

---

[1] *C. J.* II, 19.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 54. The Committee for Scandalous Ministers is often referred to in the Common Journals as the Committee for Preaching Ministers. It was one of the first sub-committees appointed by the Grand Committee on Religion, and it handled petitions dealing with the preaching and the lives of scandalous ministers. It in no way dealt with patrimony or patronage but was concerned only with the general lives and activities of the clergy.

[3] The Plundered Ministers Committee at first undertook relief work for ministers ejected by the Royalists and those pastors who had suffered under Laud. Gradually, the committee absorbed some of the functions of the Committee for Scandalous Ministers but never fully superceded it. The primary task of the Committee for Plundered Ministers was to see to the relief and placement of faithful non-Royalist pastors. In such a capacity the Committee soon became a "board of ecclesiastical commissioners for a completely disestablished and a partially disendowed English Church." Shaw, *op. cit.*, II, 195. It had no funds of its own but simply sequestered certain livings and saw that faithful Puritan pastors were appointed to receive the revenues of the rejected Royalists.

[4] Glass, *op. cit.*, p. 48. "Between 1640 and 1645 he was appointed to two hundred and thirty select committees." Glass gives a thorough outline of Rous's political activities, but he glosses over Rous's activity with the Presbyterian party and does not adequately relate any of his activity to his theology.

[5] Bulstrode Whitelock, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 1853), I, 238.

The English Presbyterian party was predominant in the Westminister Assembly, controlled most of London, and gained an added strength from the Scottish army and presence of the four Scottish divines, Baillie, Blair, Henderson, and Gillespie. They felt that the Solemn League and Covenant undertaken between the English and Scottish people was a pledge to bring the English Church into a reformed condition such as that which prevailed in Scotland. But through the astuteness of Sir Harry Vane, the English had added a phrase to the Covenant which pledged England to the Scottish system so far as it was agreeable with the Word of God.[1] In September of 1643 both Houses adopted the Covenant with this provision.

The Westminister Assembly originally grew out of a motion by Francis Rous that a number of divines should be appointed to prepare the way to settle the Church in doctrine and discipline.[2]

---

[1] The English acceptance of the Solemn League and Covenant appears to have been the product of necessity. While Parliament determined, in the debates of 1641-42, that Episcopacy was to be abolished and that the national Church was to be reconstructed so as to agree with the Word of God and the best reformed Churches, England was determined to do this in an English way through the help of their own Assembly of Divines. When the desperate military situation of 1643 required the help of Scotland, they demanded as a price for their aid the reformation of the English Church according to the Scottish Presbyterian system. The Solemn League and Covenant pledged the subscribers to extirpate papacy and prelacy, to preserve the established religion of Scotland, and to endeavour to bring the Church in the three kingdoms into a uniformity and conjunction. The phrase inserted by Sir Harry Vane was all that saved the English from an outright commitment to a reformation along purely Scottish Presbyterian lines. As it was, most Englishmen felt that they had commited themselves under pressure and to too great an extent.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 123.

This was in March of 1642, but it was not until a long and torturous series of bills that the Assembly was actually determined upon by an ordinance of June 12, 1643.[1] The Assembly was originally composed of 30 lay assesors, 121 English divines, 5 Scottish clerics and 3 laymen and 3 clerks.[2] Usually sixty members were present to transact business.[3] Their purpose was only that of a board of experts to advise Parliament in all matters pertaining to religion and to help draw up some form of religious establishment to replace that of Episcopacy which had already been swept away.[4] It did not take long for the Assembly to look upon its position as more than advisors to an erastian Parliament, but Parliament never let slip its firm grip upon the Assembly's proceedings. It is peculiar that Parliament allowed Rous to be the go-between between the House and Assembly and sit as one of the lay assesors if he was such a staunch Presbyterian. It seems more likely that the trust placed in him both by an Erastian House and a predominantly Presbyterian Assembly was due to the fact that he did carry himself as a "member of no sect" and "turned neither to the right nor the left," but followed the middle path.

On the whole, however, it seems clear that Rous was favorable to most of the plans and hopes of the Assembly, though whenever Parliament changed any of the divines' suggestions Rous did not intrigue to change the decision. He did not hesitate, however, to keep Baillie informed of certain developments in House committees so the Assembly would know what steps were to be taken with regard to certain matters. The first point at which cooperation between Rous and Baillie was clearly shown was in the problem of ordination of ministers. The Assembly spent several months debating on a directory for ordination and finally succeeded, April, 1644, in drawing up a directory with twelve propositions concerning the doctrinal portion of ordination.[1] The House received the report and appointed a sub-committee of the Grand Committee on Religion to consider the whole matter.

---

[1] *Ibid*., pp. 124-217, n. 5.

[2] Wm.M.Hethrington, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines* (New York: R. Carter and Brothers, 1853), p. 103.

[3] Robert Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, 1637-1662, ed., David Lang (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1842), II, 108.

[4] Shaw, *op*. *cit*., I, 117-121.

Through Rous, the chief of the sub-committee, Baillie found out that the Assembly's report was so altered that the doctrinal aspects of ordination were completely overlooked. He "persuaded" Rous that the committee should make use of its right to call in advisors from the Assembly before the final committee report was handed in. Rous obtained an order from the House to that effect and drew upon some of the staunch Presbyterian Assembly members to advise his committee.[2] In the end it all made little difference because the ordination formula finally passed was unacceptable even though it was only pro tempore.[3]

In several other cases Rous cooperated with Baillie and the Presbyterian party and favored the Assembly's attempt to set up the Presbyterian system. This was especially the case when the Independents tried to establish tolerance for themselves by a swift stroke in the House before the Assembly had even had a chance to report its advice on Presbyteries. Rous, Tate, and Prideaux opposed Vane and others on this diplomatic maneuver.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 318-325. [2] Baillie's Letters, II, 198-199.

[3] Shaw, op. cit., I, 333.

[4] Baillie's Letters, II, 232 ff.

According to all evidence available to this author, Rous continued to cooperate with the Presbyterians at least until 1646 and perhaps somewhat longer. Though he was a member of the important House committee that answered the Assembly's claim to a _jus divinum_ for the eldership and also accused the Assembly of a breach of House privileges, there was no way for the author to ascertain what attitude Rous took towards the whole matter. A. B. Glass takes for granted that Rous was in agreement with the committee report, but he offers no evidence to substantiate this.[1] Baillie does not refer to Rous with regard to this all-important question, so it is probable that at least Rous was not actively engaged in behalf of the Presbyterian party's rights. If Baillie had a good man working on his side of a touchy problem he invariably reported that in his correspondence home or to the London Presbyterians.

The reply of the House was the end of the Presbyterian attempt to capture the Church life of England. To the extent that the system was set up, it never found any adherents beyond Lancashire and London. Hereafter, Presbyterian churches were to be allowed but only on the same basis as Independents or Baptists. The House quickly revived the Committee to consider how a preaching ministry could be established and maintained throughout England.[2] Rous was back to work at his favorite job. From that time on, the House paid little attention to Assembly disputations on Church government.[3] The only thing which the Assembly was still to complete proved to be their most lasting contribution, the Westminister Confession.

---

[1] Common Journals, the various diaries of the period, Rushworth, and all other collections, Shaw, Masson, Gardiner--none of these offered any information on this vital point.

[2] Shaw, _op. cit._, I, 262-297, II, 1-33.

[3] Glass, _op. cit._, pp. 43-44.

The other matter in which Rous had Baillie's cooperation was in the adoption of the former's metrical Psalms. Though Baillie preferred the translation of a Scottish acquaintance, he also thought highly of Rous's version and seemed to have worked for its adoption. The strange thing is that this Englishman's version of the Psalms, though revised and corrected, became the basis of the official Scottish version of the Psalms.[1] Though Baillie laments the fact that Rous went over to the sectaries, he still had the highest regard for him and often sought his help to intercede with Cromwell in certain matters.[2]

From 1646 until 1650 when he retired for a short time, Rous continued his work on the Plundered Ministers Committee and was the moving power behind the whole scheme. There seems to be no evidence of his cooperation with the Presbyterian party after 1647. The usual date given for his break with the Presbyterians is 1649 when he published a tract upholding the lawfulness of obeying the government after Pride's Purge. Even in this tract he refers to himself as "one that Loves all Presbyterian lovers of Truth and Peace, and is of their Communion."[3] The Tract is written against the Presbyterians who were trying to offer a passive resistance to the government. Another thing indicative of his having left the Presbyterian party was his presence in Parliament after Pride's Purge in 1648.

---

[1] Baillie's Letters, II, 120-121, 293, 312, 329-335, 379; III, 532-556 is an excellent survey of the history of Rous's version of the metrical psalms.

[2] Baillie's Letters, III, 97, 325 f., 332., 344-347.

[3] F. Rous, The Lawfulness of obeying the Present Government and Acting under it, With some other Additions to a former Edition, By one that Loves all Presbyterian lovers of Truth and Peace, and is one of their communion (London: John Wright, 1649).

How, then, could Rous the mystic and advocate of comprehension back the Presbyterian party from 1643 until around 1646 or 1647? From the viewpoint of his being a mystic it would not be too difficult. Rous felt the need of an external Church, the preached Word, and the sacraments. The Presbyterian system seemed to offer the possibility of obtaining all the reforms and positive constructions of the Church that Rous longed for. They, of all parties in England, gave promise of being able to erect a decent parish system. Little wonder that Rous worked with these men. But when Presbyterianism showed signs of being unable to reestablish the parish ministry and had little public support, Rous appears to have turned his back on it and embraced Independency. The fact is, he never ceased working on the Plundered Ministers' Committee even while he was cooperating with the Presbyterian party.

There is nothing in his theology or treatises which would contradict the shift to Independency. He was seventy years old when it was made, and it was hardly likely that he was suddenly converted to Independency. Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, or Independency--all were successive stages in a continuing quest to have the Word preached throughout England so men might be brought into a union with Christ. None of the three were absolutely essential in themselves but all three offered in turn possibilities of satisfying the needs of the English people in terms of a national Church. He could advocate without hesitancy the one which appeared to have the greatest chance of being accepted by the people and of serving as the Church of Christ. In light of these facts it appears that Rous was an "opportunist" in the very best sense of the term. Some type of decent polity was absolutely essential but no single type was anything but relative. Rous never went beyond the idea of a type of national established Church, but its exact form was not its most important aspect. A limited toleration was to be practiced that the love of God in a saint might bear fruit.

It was because of his mystical theology, his interest in a mild toleration, and his concern for a consecrated, decently maintained ministry that he was driven from one type of polity to another but never attempted to transcend or reject an external national Church. Truly, he was attempting to walk the path of the Spirit as a member of no sect and seeking truth in all sects. In the midst of his endeavors, he offered the hand of Christian love and fellowship to such different men as Baillie, Seldon, Vane and Cromwell. His actions in behalf of the various groups do not contradict his mystical theology but appear, rather, as an outgrowth from it.

In 1649 and 1650 Rous wrote two treatises upholding the necessity of obeying the government after Pride's Purge and also claiming that such action was not contrary to the Solomn League and Covenant. He had nothing to do with the death of the king, but he approved all of Cromwell's subsequent actions. The reasons given for obeying the government rest solely on the necessity of the circumstances. The powers that are, are ordained of God, and the present government in power, though in office by illegal means, is actually in power and enables men to have justice and to live a peaceable life in godliness and honesty. He quotes a long list of authorities to prove that even tyrants are to be obeyed if they govern according to justice and order.[1]

Within the next two years several tracts were written against his arguments,[1] and he replied in a larger tract elaborating most of his previous contentions.[2] Again he argues that "we have nothing else to doe in the world, but to praise God and love our neighbor," and that the job of the magistrate is only to encourage this and to see that it is done in security. How that magistrate got in office was not the question to be debated, for the fact was that the power was already operative and there appeared no good chance of its being overthrown. The question was one of obedience to the power of the magistrate as it was actually in operation at that time. Forms of government and change of those forms according to the customary formalities of a quiet people are not the same at all times "but rather according to the extreme necessity of state." Necessity is above all forms of government. The old form of State as it was in King, Lords, and Commons was "civilly dead, not being able any longer to act any thing." But a civil body cannot live without a head so it follows "that we are in the state of a Republieke; no other power now informing or actuating us. . . . than that to be found now. . . .at Westminister."[3]

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 5, 6, 9-10, 15, 16-17, 19.

---

[1] *An Enquiry after further satisfaction concerning Obeying a Change of Government beleeved to be unlawfull. Tendred to Presbyterian Proposer (F. Rous, Elder) by way of reply. . . .* (London:G. Thomason, 1649). *A Second Part of the Religious Demurrer by another hand. An answer to a tract (by F. Rous. . . .* (London: Thomas Underhill, 1649). *The Grand Case of Conscience stated, about Submission to the present Power. An ansere to a book concerning the Lawfulness of submitting to the present Government*. (London, 1649).

[2] F. Rous, *The Bounds and Bonds of Publique Obedience Or a Vindication of our lawfull submission to the present Government, or to a government supposed unlawfull, but commanding lawfull things. Likewise how such obedience is consistent with our solemn League and Covenant* (London: John Wright, 1650). This treatise did not have Rous's name affixed, but it is undoubtedly his. It was catalogued as Rous's by George Thomason, answered as such by Nathanial Ward, and exhibits a full recapitulation and enlargement of the argument of the *Lawfulness of Obeying*, and answers the above three tracts written against *Lawfulness*.

[3] Rous, *Bounds and Bonds*, pp. 3,5,6,13.

The same argument of necessity which enabled him to back various ecclesiastical parties to gain a certain end, appears to have been employed in his discussion of political affairs.

Arguing against the Presbyterian party with its demand for the literal fulfillment of the Solemn League and Covenant and the establishment of an exclusive Presbyterian system, Rous said that England did not break the Covenant but it died of itself as impossible of fulfillment. A Covenant is not an "eternall obligation" but is involved in the "accidents of the world, which may justly incumber us from effecting it, or from being further obliged to it." Furthermore, when the Scots invaded England and opened the second Civil War they abrogated the Covenant.[1] The only alternative to the Church controlling the state through the Presbyterian system was, so far as Rous could see, an Erastian one.[2] And one strongly suspects that this was Rous's attitude even while working with the Westminster Assembly, for though he continued to serve on several Commons committees of religion, he seems to have been of little help to the Presbyterians when he served on the all-important committee concerning the breach of privilege.[3]

Against the Presbyterian claim that their system must be put into effect to the exclusion of all other systems, which claim Rous never appeared to be fully supporting, he replied that religion is only to be "injoyn'd" as much as one man can convince another. True "moral vertue" is an inward thing and operates only through the "free concurrence of the wil," and that cannot be discovered by any outward means. As to the compulsion of the people according to a particular confession of faith he completely opposes it because they are:

---

[1] *Ibid*., pp. 35-36, 38-48, 50.

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 57-58.

[3] See above, p. 268.

> . . . . but logicall deductions out of Scripture, Ergo not indubitably, true enough by force obtruded on mens faiths. . . . we are taught that it is a popish opinion to beleeve any company of men are infallible, in what they propose: wherefore the Magistrate doe no more safely, then recommend, not force, their notions and Logick on the people. But in case of . . . . a morall thing he may be more peremptory than in a Divine, because those things are certainlyer known to us as men, then what is of divine revelation and reference.[1]

It was under Cromwell and the Independents that Rous was able to accomplish his major work in behalf of a preaching ministry in every parish. It is significant that Cromwell was proud of the semi-establishment attained under his rule. One of the most difficult things to determine about Cromwell is his religious position. John Buchan said that he was, in essence, a mystic.[2] There are , of course, no sermons from the pen of the Protector, and he produced no religious treatises by which one might determine if he was a mystic or not. Letters and personal correspondence may yield fuller insights into a man's personality, but, in themselves, they often do not provide sufficient, consistent, or fully articulate expressions of a man's thought or experience so one can determine his exact religious or theological position. Undoubtedly, the mystical element of the religious life was strongly emphasized in Cromwell's life, but, as stated earlier in this study, that does not constitute a mystic.[3] It might be possible to determine his position or at least the strongest tendencies at work in his religious life by consulting his letters and speeches,[4] but it would be impossible within the scope of this chapter to determine if he was a mystic, a spiritualist, or neither. Certainly such a study should be made in the near future.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[2] John Buchan, Oliver Cromwell (London: Hodder and Staughton, 1935), pp. 67 f., 529 f.

[3] See above I.

[4] On the basis of his numerous letters and speeches, it may be possible to determine if he was either, but the evidence deduced by Buchan does not prove he was a "mystic" but only emphasized the prominence of the mystical element in his religion. For

At this point it is sufficient to note that Cromwell was widely tolerant of different types of Christianity but was also intent upon retaining some type of national establishment. After Pride's Purge in December of 1648, Cromwell and the Independents were in control. Parliament continued to pursue the plan of propagating the Gospel but never succeeded in passing a bill for the whole nation, though it did pass several for particular sections of the Commonwealth. But most of these schemes proved abortive.[1] It was not until the Protectorate that an actual practical scheme was put into operation.

In 1653 the Rump Parliament was dissolved, and England was without any of its time honored institutions--King, Lords, Commons, and Church. Cromwell ruled with a Council of State, but he soon decided to call a handpicked Parliament composed of "known men, men fearing God, and of approved integrity."[2] When this "Little" or"Barebones" Parliament assembled, it comprised a group of men of no mean repute, and it certainly did not deserve the unfair treatment it received from historians.[3] Francis Rous was chosen speaker of Barbones Parliament, and he played a conspicuous

---

those passages which are most indicative of this tendency see any of the editions of Cromwells Letters and Speeches, letters II, XLI, CXXXII, and CLXXXVII; speech I. Nuttall, op. cit., pp. 124-128 give footnote references and not a few excellent quotations from those letters and speeches which tend to portray Cromwell as a spiritualist.

[1] Shaw, op. cit., II, 81-84, 226-227, 245-246, 283.

[2] Glass, op. cit., p. 61.

[3] Ibid., passim.

part in its deliberations and dissolution.[1] The radical Fifth-Monarchy group under Harrison was bent upon abolishing tithes and the Universities, but Cromwell's party would not hear of it.[2] When affairs reached a dangerous state, Rous in cooperation with some of Cromwell's closer advisors gathered their faction for an early morning meeting, and before Harrison's group had arrived in strength the Cromwellian party voted the resignation of Parliament. Rous, followed by a majority group, returned to Cromwell and surrendered to him the mace and Parliamentary powers.[3]

After the dissolution of Barebones Parliament, Cromwell was sworn in as Lord Protector, and he immediately selected a Council of State. Francis Rous was one of the chief members.[4] His name appears numerous times with regard to the work of the Council, and usually it occurs in conjunction with problems of poor relief, sequestered livings, and other problems of religion.[5] However, the thing we are particularly interested in is the so-called established Church of Cromwell of which Rous was the head trier. One of the first things the Protector and Council did was to pass an Ordinance for Approbation of Public Preachers[6] which set up a board of triers to pass upon candidates for the ministry and grant admission to a benefice. Later, an "Ordinance for Ejection of

---

[1] Great Britian, Public Record Office, *Calander of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Collections of Venice, . . . .* Vol. XXIX, (1653-54) (London: Longmans and Co., 1929), pp. 101, 131, 139, 160.

[2] Cobbett, *op. cit.*, III, 1409-1415; Baxter, *Rel. Baxt.*, p. 70.

[3] *Cal. S.P.*, *Venetian*, XXIX, 160; cf., David Masson, *The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connexion With the Political, Ecclesiastical, an Literary History of His Time* (London: Macmillan, 1896), IV, 505 ff.

[4] *Cal. S. P.*, *Domestic*, *1653-1654*, XIX, 298.

[5] *Ibid.*, see indexes.

[6] *Ibid.*, XX, 127.

Scandalous, Ignorant, and Insufficient Ministers and Schoolmasters" was added.[1] Finally, an "Ordinance for Maintenance" completed the organization of the new establishment.[2]

With the passage of these three ordinances the Cromwellian settlement of the Church was accomplished. The Board of Triers headed by Francis Rous conceived of their task as the discernment of godly men who would prove excellent preachers and good pastors in a parish. There was no talk of doctrinal subscription or even of the sacraments or discipline. All such things were left up to the local congregation, but the state passed upon the man offered to a benefice and saw to his maintenance. In reality this was a national establishment of comprehension and breadth. Local presbyteries could be formed, the Baptists had complete freedom, and the Independents had at last achieved their goal. Certain sectaries were not happy because this was still an Erastian national establishment. Episcopalians could serve in their local parishes but they were ejected if royalist, and a diocesan arrangement was not permitted in any district. Bishop and King were still regarded as two sides of the same coin--oppression. H. A. Glass gives good reasons to believe that a number of Episcopal clergymen passed the Board of Approbation.[3]

Though they could not tolerate royalists, the commissioners on Approbation and Ejection were not concerned primarily with weeding out objectionable Episcopalians. They aimed to free parishes of inefficient and evidently insincere pastors. They were bound to be somewhat prejudiced against certain types of men, but on the whole they seem to have done more good than harm. Baxter, who opposed them, said he would speak the truth about them and admitted that "so great was the benefit above the hurt, which they brought to the Church, that many thousands of Souls blest God for the faithful Ministers whom they let in, and grieved when the Prelatists afterward cast them out again." He said the Triers "saved many Congregation from ignorant, ungodly drunken Teachers" and from all the men who used the ministry as a trade or failed to preach sufficiently and to lead godly lives.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 308.

[2] Glass, op. cit., pp. 117-125 gives the text for the three ordinances.

[3] Ibid., pp. 129, 131.

So, Francis Rous the Puritan mystic who advocated a limited toleration and full love to all brethren united to Christ Jesus became the head Trier for Cromwell's Board of Approbation. There he could actively direct the selection of sincere godly men for the ministry and know that through the Commission for Maintenance an honest attempt was being made to see that all ministers received an adequate sustenance.[2]

As a Puritan mystic he still felt the need of the preached Word, the sacraments, and a decently settled congregation. In a way, his life was a pilgrimage that sought to vitalize and reform the organization of the Church while never rejecting the Puritan cultus. Episcopacy would not be reformed, Presbyterianism proved incapable of carrying through its program for all of England and refused to extend the hand of fellowship and love to any but her own, but Cromwell's settlement brought order out of chaos and offered some possibility of achieving the goal of sincere pastors preaching the Word in decently settled parishes throughout England.

---

[1] Baxter, Relq. Baxt., I, 72.

[2] As a member of the Council of State Rous continued his work with regard to an adequate maintenance of the ministry. Cf., Cal. S. P., Domestic 1655-56, XXII, 301, 309, 327.

The mystic as Parliamentarian had attained his goal. He never achieved the conception of toleration enunciated by Roger Wiliams or John Milton, but he succeeded in playing a vital role in the creation, establishment, and operation of a system that exhibited the broadest degree of comprehension that the English Church has ever seen. Certainly Francis Rous was as responsible for this type of settlement as was any man in England.

# CHAPTER VII

# CONCLUSION

It is a difficult task to summarize the arguments and evidence of this thesis. In some respects one can say that it has raised far more problems than it has solved. If that is true, then the author is somewhat satisfied. The existence of Puritan mysticism has received scant attention from historians, and to my knowledge, there have been no studies of any genuine Puritan mystics. The primary aim of this thesis was to prove Francis Rous a Puritan mystic, the first Puritan mystic, and to show how he developed out of Puritanism and related his mysticism to the movement of which he was a part. In order to prove him a mystic, an attempt was made to establish a typology which would at once mark him as a mystic yet distinguish him from men who represent a similar tendency of religious experience, but who are, nevertheless, a distinct type of their own.

The secondary aim of the thesis was to advance both the typology and the analysis of Rous according to that typology as the first step in the clarification and elucidation of a greatly maligned, ignored, and confused aspect of Puritanism. Thus the discussion attempts to serve as an introduction to the further study of the mystical element in Puritanism, and through that, it hopes to propose several questions with regard to future research in Puritanism. On the basis of material already presented, it is even now possible to state several questions and to propose a few generalizations.

Two main questions are provoked by the conclusions and evidence of this thesis. The first deals with the emergence of the mystical element of religion out of the surroundings of English Puritanism. Many scholars have not even recognized the existence of a genuine mystical tendency or movement within Puritanism, and even more students have been prone to limit the appearance of the mystical element to those individuals and groups who came to the fore during the Commonwealth era. Others have recognized it, but they have seldom shown its development out of Puritanism. The second question is that posed by the typology produced in the first chapter. If there are two distinct types of the mystical element in religion, mysticism and spiritualism, and perhaps sub-types for each of those, does that not mean a new factor is to be employed in research in this particular area? What are some of the possible results to be obtained from the use of the typology? Without proposing any definite answers for these questions, we are in a position to offer several possible solutions.

Only recently have students of Puritanism admitted the presence of a mystical element in groups and individuals within Puritanism. Perhaps that is due to the fact that most histories of the movement have been written with regard to the polity and political implications but few with regard to the theology and piety of Puritanism.[1] Troeltsch and Weber were the first two scholars to recognize a mystical element in Puritanism and to relate that element to the Puritan ethic and idea of Church and society.[1] It was indicated in a previous chapter that their failure to distinguish between mysticism and spiritualism and some of their generalizations about the Puritan ethic and mysticism are open to question.[2] Nevertheless, their studies of Puritan piety, polity, and theology are still the indispensable groundwork for any discussion of Puritanism in general and Puritan mysticism in particular.

---

[1] Daniel Neal, The History of the Puritans of Protestant Non-Conformists (3 vols., 2nd.; London: J. Buckland, J. Waugh, and W. Fenner, 1754). John Stoughton, History of Religion in England, From the Opening of the Long Parliament to the End of the Eighteenth Century (New York: A.C.Armstrong and Son,) 1882), 5 vols. Shaw, op. cit.,All these works are similar to each other and to previous and succeeding works in their neglect of Puritan faith and experience. A long list could be given to show the shortcoming of most previous histories of Puritanism on this particular point. Robert Barclay, The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth: Considered Principally With Reference to the Influence of Church Organization on the Spread of Christianity (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876), though devoted primarily to to the polity of the various Puritan groups, it gave a great deal

Almost all recent students of Puritanism have corrected one generalization of Max Weber by insisting on the presence of an emotional element in Puritan piety.[3] They rebelled against the older treatment of Puritanism as a cold, rational, regulated, unbending, literal faith. Both M. M. Knappen and William Haller have done much to put in bold relief the emotional aspect of Puritan faith. The most recent author on Puritan theology did an excellent job of portraying Puritan faith and experience and of showing the intimate connexion between the personal conviction of the believer

---

of information on Puritan faith and experience; nevertheless, he too failed to indicate what was meant by Puritan mystical religion and to relate it to development of Puritanism itself.

[1] Weber, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Troeltsch, *op. cit.*, II, 677 ff.

[2] See above, III, 101 ff., I, 23, n. 1.

[3] Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, pp. 208-349; Jones, *Mysticism and Democracy*, *passim*; Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, pp. 449-500, was among the first to note the presence of a mystical element in Puritanism, but he failed to distinguish between mysticism and spiritualism and also traced the emergence of this element to the influence of Continental thinkers rather than attempting to find its sources in English Puritanism. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, pp. 339-353, 391-400, pointed out the strong emotional aspect in Puritanism but failed to recognize a mystical element in it. The same can be said for Miller's *The New England Mind*, pp. 3-63, and for Haller's *The Rise of Puritanism*. The latter recognized that there was such a thing as mysticism in Puritanism, but he also did not define what that term meant nor did he trace its growth out of Puritanism.

and the religious dogmas or tenets that he embraced.[1] With the new emphasis on Puritan piety as "experiential" it is difficult to understand why more attention has not been paid to Puritanism itself as the primary source of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism.[2] That is not to deny the influence of Continental mystical and spiritual tracts, but it is to say that there were present in the theology, piety, and external history of Puritanism those factors which were extremely favorable to the production of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism.

It is impossible to say exactly why mysticism arose out of Puritanism at a certain time and flowered more fully at another time, but it is possible to indicate those tendencies within the movement favorable to the appearance of mysticism.[3] The following explanation is as plausible a hypothesis as is available to the author at the present writing. It is based upon his limited research and is certainly open to correction or even rejection; nevertheless, it is an attempt to answer a question created by the conclusions of the thesis and also a question that will be imperative in any future discussion of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism.

---

[1] Dr. Geoffrey Nuttall, op. cit., was one of the first scholars who attempted to deal with Puritan faith and experience both as a logical and historical development. He offers an excellent analysis that will go far to clarify one of the most difficult periods of history.

[2] Rufus Jones, more than any one man, was aware of the mystical element in Puritanism, but never did he attempt to show its outgrowth from Puritanism. He went to great pains to show the similarity between certain Quaker tendencies and the earlier German "spiritual reformers," and wherever sources permitted he recounted the infiltration of Continental spiritual and mystical literature through translations and pulpit. Furthermore, he seems to have taken for granted that Everard, Rous, Vane, Randall and other men of"mystical" tendencies became what they were because of their reaction to Puritanism. One of the merits of Dr. Nuttall's work is to show that such men were not so much in reaction to Puritanism as they were a certain type of development out of it.

[3] See above, I 33 ff.

Both the theological characteristics of Puritanism itself and the historical era of which it was a part are responsible for the rise and development of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism at a certain period in English history. Any such explanation takes for granted the necessity of human beings whose "psychological temper" is favorable, or at least not contradictory, to mystical religion.

There were two basic characteristics of Puritanism which were somewhat in opposition though usually held in tension, and both eventually helped to produce Puritan mystics and spiritualists. On the one hand there was a Biblicism or literalism that was rather common to prophetic religion of the seventeenth century. God had revealed his will and love in Christ Jesus, and Scripture was the infallible conveyer of that will. The Puritan was attempting to bring the whole universe and all aspects of life under subjection to the divine will as revealed in the Bible. There was, then, an objective revelation available to all who could read and hear correctly. It was part and parcel of history both as to its having happened once and for all in the past and as to its being objectively present in the written Scripture. Furthermore, this divine will had produced and called forth an institution which was to live, move, and have its very form and being according to the revealed will of God.

On the other hand, Puritanism always exhibited an intense immediacy between the soul and God. While many students can no longer agree with Troeltsch's stressing the extreme individualism of the solitary believer in English Puritanism, they can still agree with his characterization of the intimate personal relation between the believer and God in Christ.[1] This was the aspect of Puritanism which stressed the "experimentall" relation of belief. The heart ruled supreme, and the Puritan "felt" or "tasted" what he preached and believed.

---

[1] Troeltsch, _op_. _cit_., II, 680.

How then did the mystical element come to the foreground in English Puritanism? There are many possible explanations, but one which seems probable to me accounts for its emergence out of Puritanism itself at a time when the Puritan movement as a totality was unable to hold in tension the personal and historical aspects of its faith because of the tremendous duress of historical circumstance. It is not accidental that Puritanism did not produce its first mystic until over half a century of struggle to accomplish its goal. When mysticism did appear, it was not as a flight from the pressure but more as a counter-balance to restore an original element of Puritanism itself--the personal, emotional aspect. Naturally, this too was carried to extremes.

The emergence of mysticism and spiritualism might appear something like this. Most early Puritans in their attempt to establish a purer reformation in England seemed to possess a fairly decent balance between the historical and personal elements of their faith. In urging reform upon Edward and later upon Elizabeth, they did not in the earlier days go to extremes in their demands for purification of the worship service or in their rejection of certain vestments. Though the Bible was the supreme norm of faith and polity, they were not adverse to diligent, hardworking, conscientious bishops as long as they would see that adequate discipline was maintained in local parishes and as long as they did not try to act as "Lord Bishops." Furthermore, these early Puritans kept their literal, historical emphasis well in balance by stressing the personal and immediate relation of the soul to God. Of course, the two emphases varied in different men, but on the whole the Puritan movement in its entirety can be characterized in its earlier days as a sane and workable balance between these two expressions of the religious life.

But things were not long to remain that way. The saga of the Puritan attempt at a purification and further reformation of the Church of England was a continual tale of frustration and defeat. At every turn the Puritans were balked. They attempted to pamphleteer, they tried to win Convocation, they sought the help of the lawyers, and they worked through Parliament. But all was in vain. They turned their attention from reform in worship and vestments to a more important problem--episcopal rule. And so Puritans and Anglicans engaged in a desperate struggle over the legitimacy of diocesan Episcopacy. The Anglicans, ably led by Hooker, easily disposed of Cartwright's and Traver's arguments. But the real damage was being done to the character of Puriatnism itself.

Unable to reform the Anglican Church, continually thwarted by queen and bishops, Puritanism began to lay more and more stress on the literal aspect of its faith. Now it whole-heartedly had to attack Episcopacy as contrary to divine will. No longer was it possible to hope for a gradual transformation of the Church for Puritans were not given a chance to undertake any of their reform measures. Their greatest weapon of attack and defense was the divine will as objectively revealed in Scripture. From the earlier Elizabethan Puritans, who wished to see purity through discipline and a preaching ministry, to Cartwright and Travers was one step, but from Cartwright and Travers, to Udall, Wigginton, Penry and the Marprelate Tracts was a radical advance. Again, it is to be understood that these latter men were not indicative of the average Puritan of their day. The do represent, however, a new type of Puritan--a product of the continual disappointment and subjugation of the movement. Though they are the extreme, the party as a whole had moved closer to the strong defense of literalism.

The possibility for success under James was vindictively smashed at the Hampden Conference. And to make matters worse, James favored a group of men who were even more high-church and high handed. His foreign policy seemed bent towards an alliance with the hated Catholic Spaniards, and it utterly failed to aid the beleaguered Continental Protestants. The rise of the Arminian clergy and their preferment under Charles was just about the last blow to the Puritans. In their attempt to meet the problems of the Stuart settlement the Puritans had recourse to colonization, non-separating Independency, and Independency or Separatism. The last three were buttressed by appeal to the divine will as objectively revealed in Scripture.

This background material is given that a more perfect understanding of the external fortunes of Puritanism might be kept in mind. Certainly such facts are not unrelated to the rise of the mystical element in Puritanism. It seems very probable that as the Puritans were thwarted repeatedly and fought back by renewed appeals to the objective certainty of the divine will in behalf of their cause, they tended to stress the literal or historical element of their faith to the exclusion or to the detriment of the personal or experiential. This can be seen in the extreme in such men as Udall, Penry, Bastwick, and Prynne. The presence of these extremists in the movement happens to coincide with the emergence of those men who stress, to a large degree, the personal or subjective aspect of Puritanism. But that will be treated later. Here it is sufficient to indicate that Puritanism in its many battles with Anglicanism tended to move closer to the right as evidenced by literalism and Biblicism.

Not only did the stress on literalism tend to produce a reaction in favor of the inwardness of religion, but in itself it tended to foster spiritualism and perhaps even mysticism. Men moved from group to group as they underwent a spiritual pilgrimage seeking the "true Church" which was established according to divine will. Some men, after passing through Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist communions, came to the conclusion that none of these groups were divinely ordained and all lacked validity.[1] As a result, they waited on the Spirit for a new dispensation which would reveal a new apostolic church. Thus literalism carried to an extreme, ended in dependence upon the Spirit and resulted in the suspension of all outward forms. Some passed from this to the belief that true worship was already revealed in a purely spiritual worship apart from all externals.

Just as Puritanism moved to the right in its fight against Anglicanism, so it moved to the left in a reaction against literalism and the neglect of the personal and experiential element of religion. One of the first evidences of an extreme emphasis on the personal appropriation of salvation was in the writing of Lewis Bayly.[2] He did not neglect the historical aspects of faith, but he tended to emphasize the personal or subjective aspects of religious life to an extent that was unknown to earlier Puritanism. Bayly was active at the same time that the extreme literalists of the Marprelate type were producing their tracts. Francis Rous was really the first Puritan mystic, and as it has been shown, he moved into mysticism directly from Puritanism and never left the Puritan fold. He was not in reaction to Puritanism but represented the extension of one aspect of Puritan piety. The same might well be said about John Everard and Giles Randall. It remains for future research to determine this point.

---

[1] Hudson, "Mystical Religion in the Commonwealth," _op_. _cit_., p. 59.

[2] See above, I, 28 ff.

Such a development of Puritanism is probably an oversimplification and requires many modifications. It, nevertheless, appears to present an actual movement in English Puritanism. Not to be overlooked is the Puritan emphasis on the Holy Spirit, because it was this doctrine that enabled the Puritan to assert the personal aspect of religion and so to move on to spiritualism and mysticism. Furthermore, there were certain Continental influences at work on Puritanism, but most of these were not of too great importance until after 1640. By that time mysticism and spiritualism were well underway in the Puritan camp.

To the question about the source of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism the answer might well be given that it was primarily the result of the readaptation of Puritan piety, polity, and theology to the continual frustrations of the attempted reformation of the English Church. It was an antidote to extreme legalism and offered a basis of comprehension transcending severely restricted boundaries. It first appeared after the fulminations of extreme literalists, and it flowered in the Commonwealth era when no one Church succeeded in bringing uniformity and peace. Springing from Puritanism itself, it drew strength from Bernard, Dionysius, the medieval German mystics, the German spiritualists, and the Family of Love.

Granting the existence of a mystical element in Puritanism, a further difficulty is encountered in trying to determine if a man is a mystic or a spiritualist. The typology advanced in the first chapter proved quite satisfactory when applied to Francis

Rous. It succeeded in distinguishing him as a mystic and thus helped to explain his part in the Puritan attempt to establish the holy community, his attitude towards the Church, ministry, and sacraments, and his relation to the Puritan ethic. If the typology proved helpful with regard to Francis Rous, the question of its applicability to the entire field of Puritanism arises.

It has already been observed that no writer in the field of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism has offered a satisfactory typology to distinguish between the two types.[1] In light of the conclusions of chapter one, a restudy of the whole problem of Puritan mysticism seems in order. First, the question concerning what men may be classified as actual mystics presents itself. Using the typology referred to, this author would tentatively state that the following men appear to be mystics in the fullest sense of the term: John Everard, Giles Randall, Peter Sterry, and perhaps Morgan Llwyd and Walter Cradock.[2] There may well be other men unknown to me, but the names given are those Puritan leaders who were active and well known throughout the Commonwealth period.

Once the historian succeeds in determining if a man is or is not a mystic, the next problem is to determine his relation to Puritanism and to other types of mysticism. The former is of the utmost importance for the general history of Puritanism because it will show at what specific points a man moved from Puritanism into mysticism and if that movement was a reaction to Puritanism or an extension of certain prevalent characteristics of Puritanism. The latter is of equal importance because it will indicate the sources external to Puritanism which were used by a mystic. Also, it will serve in the long run to help the student of Puritanism determine if all Puritan mystics are alike, if there is such a movement as Puritan mysticism, and the smiliarities and differences between various Puritan mystics. All of this work is still to be undertaken by the students of Puritanism.

---

[1] See above, I, 19 f.

[2] I was unable to obtain the works of Llwyd, and I have not read Cradock extensively or carefully enough to risk any more than a very tentative judgment.

Finally, after determining that a man is a mystic and the type of mysticism he represents, it will be possible to note the sociological consequences of that mystic. Here it is most important to distinguish between mysticism and spiritualism. That problem was treated in detail in chapter one.[1] Most scholars are agreed that one of the most important aspects of Puritanism is its ethic; thus one of the most pressing problems for the student of Puritan mysticism is the relation between mysticism and the Puritan ethic.

It was noted that Rous's mysticism served to strengthen the Puritan ethic and provided a different basis for its fulfillment. It would be interesting to determine if this was generally true of Puritan mystics or if Rous was an exception. On the basis of an unsystematic reading of the possible mystics mentioned above, this author is inclined to say that none of the others made such a close conjunction between their mysticism and the Puritan ethic as did Rous. But also, it can be said that all the Puritam mystics attempted to strengthen the Puritan ethic by providing an emotional basis for what otherwise might have been a cold and arid asceticism. If this proves to be the case with Puritan mysticism in its entirety, then several of the Weber-Troeltsch generalizations are subject to drastic modifications.

---

[1] See above, I, 12-15, 20-25.

Another common generalization which will be exploded by the continued study of Puritan mysticism is that Puritanism is hostile to mysticism and produced no devotional literature of that type. This is nothing else than the question of Puritan piety in particular and Protestant piety in general. Professor Knappen did a splendid service in reemphasizing that Puritan piety was primarily emotional and not rational, but he too makes the usual comment and says that "it is equally misleading to leave the impression that the Puritans were either enthusiasts or mystics."[1]

Other modern scholars, while maintaining the intensely emotional emphasis of Puritanism, refuse to speak of Puritan mysticism or mystics. If they do use such terminology, they never define exactly what they mean by a mystic.[2] This is a field as yet hardly explored. Contrary to the usual statements, Puritan piety did produce a number of warm emotional tracts centering on the love of Jesus Christ. At times their piety strongly reminds one of that of the later German pietists. Also, Puritanism produced through men like Rous, devotional mystical treatises of fervency equal to anything produced by Roman Catholicism. From the time of Bayly, Perkins, and Sibbes, Puritanism possessed a large number of gifted men who were not mystics but preached and lived an intense piety centered about the love of Christ. The entire field of Protestant piety is ripe for a thorough investigation and study.

The historian employing a typology is in a more favorable position to judge a man's relation to the Church, sacraments, and ministry. Then it becomes possible tentatively to label a man a mystic and so to determine his stand on certain fundamental prob-

---

1 [1] Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, pp. 342, 346 f.

[2] Haller, *op. cit.*, pp. 205 ff., 271. Cf., A.S.P. Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty Being the Army Debates* 1647-49 *. . . . .* (London: J. M. Dent and sons, 1939), p. 44.

lems. This remains to be worked out with regard to the seventeenth century English Puritan mystics. As it was stated earlier in the thesis, mystics take one of two attitudes towards these vital Christian realities and seldom try to transcend them. Here the contrast with spiritualism is most marked. The entire problem is very important for the history of Puritanism because at this particular point the relation of mysticism to the Puritan attempt to establish the holy community becomes clear. It could also be said that this was one of the factors promoting the dissolution of the Puritan party after 1643 and helped to prevent the establishment of Presbyterianism.

The relation of mysticism to the problem of eschatology need hardly be mentioned. The Commonwealth era was filled with speculations concerning the literal or spiritual second coming, but mysticism has seldom paid attention to eschatology and this situation was no exception. On the other hand, mysticism seemed to play an important role in the establishment of a limited toleration in England. Never having recognized the distinctions between Puritan mysticism and spiritualism, scholars have been unable to show their separate relations and contributions to the development of toleration. Mystics produced no major tracts for toleration such as the spiritualists did; nevertheless, all of them helped produce an atmosphere which was favorable to toleration. This also remains to be established by a thorough study of the entire field of Puritan mysticism.

It is evident, then, that many questions have been raised through the use of a typology, and the typology bids fair to offer one of the best methods to cope with the most imperative questions. As a result of its application to the entire field of Puritan mysticism, it will enable the scholar to ascertain the developments, similarities, and differences of various mystics. Moreover, it will give some idea of the growth and expansion of a movement itself which might prove to be one more important example of the foliation of Puritanism.

Almost the same thing can be said with regard to the application of the typology to determine the existence of the spiritualists and to ascertain their sociological significance. Yet, in one respect, the typology is even of more importance for this group of men because they were by far the larger and more important wing of the mystical element in English Puritanism. While it is probable that there were not more than six or eight genuine Puritan mystics and no possible way to determine if any or many of the common folk followed the mystic path, it is quite certain that a vast number of the laity as well as numerous divines were Puritan spiritualists.

Perhaps it is not strange that Puritanism should have produced so many more spiritualists than mystics because the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was always of paramount importance in Puritan theology. It was comparatively a simple matter to shift from the orthodox conception of the Holy Spirit operating personally in man working his salvation, to the view that the Holy Spirit in effecting man's salvation dwelt personally and substantially (which signified spiritual) in the heart of man. This led to a differentiation from mysticism and to a certain set of ideas which were at variance with mysticism.

In applying the typology to this group or groups the same questions are raised as those which appear with respect to mysticism. The relation of spiritualism to the Puritan ethic and Puritan piety is of the greatest importance both for the understanding of Puritanism after 1640 and for a proper evaluation of spiritualism itself. The spiritualist is an iconoclast to a much greater extent than the mystic is. No matter what type of spiritualist he is, he invariably has far less use for externals than does the mystic. In that sense he represents a weakening of the Puritan ethic, piety, and cultus. His aim was not merely to revitalize Puritan forms and characteristics, but it was to transcend or destroy them or wait for them to be replaced. This, also, is an area of scholarship almost untouched.[1] The similarities and differences of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism and their consequent effect upon particular aspects of Puritanism has still to be delineated in detail.

Before such a study can be made it is first necessary to expand the typology in chapter one so it might include variations or sub-types within spiritualism itself. This is of the utmost importance in determining the relation between spiritualism and its sociological consequences for Puritanism. There appear to be at least four distinct types of spiritualists, and they find their common source and ultimate differences in the particular way they depend upon the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Sir Harry Vane, Josiah Sprigg and their group represent a type of spiritualist who never repudiated the externals of the Church, but who looked upon them as things indifferent and easily dispensed with. They were millenarians but looked only for a spiritual second coming.[2]

Another group is that characterized by Dr. Jones as the

---

[1] Dr. Nuttall, op. cit., and Dr. Johnson, op. cit., have made a splendid beginning in the right direction, but neither has made a systematic survey of all groups and individuals within spiritualism with regard to their consequences for Puritan ethic, piety, and cultus. But, their work is indispensable as a starting point for such a study.

[2] Sir Harry Vane, Two Treatises, pp. 44 ff., Vane, The Retired Man's Meditations, passim.

Seekers who suspended all external worship and form to await a new dispensation of the Holy Spirit.[1] The Finders appear to have been a third sub-type of spiritualism, and they might be called satisfied Seekers.[2] They felt that the invisible second coming had already taken place in the hearts of certain men, and the full appearance of the Spirit of God among men was soon to be completed. As a result the Finders emphasized purely spiritual worship apart from any or all external forms and polity. The fourth type of spiritualist proved to be the most lasting and important--the Quakers.[3] The Quakers alone, of all the types mentioned, formed an actual sect and perpetuated their existence. The other types frequently functioned within the Independent churches, and their real strength was usually from within such groups or centered about another stronger group such as the Army. The fact that an increasing number of Seekers and Finders, both in groups and as isolated individuals, were rapidly swallowed up by the Quakers would seem to indicate that the latter alone produced a sufficiently effective organization to maintain the existence of a definite group.

Spiritualism _in toto_, as a distinct type of Puritanism, and its relation to other Puritan groups and the entire Puritan movement itself, still has to be studied. Especially important is spiritualism's various conceptions of eschatology. This at once marks it off from Puritan mysticism and also offers a distinction between itself and literal millenarianism. But, the most important aspect of spiritualism is its social and cultural consequences. It had a direct influence upon the development of toleration and comprehension. By way of analogy it influenced the development of political democracy. A thorough study of Sir Harry Vane would show, in the last analysis, that one of the most important sources for his republican democracy was his spiritualism. Furthermore, the emphasis upon the Spirit as available to every man served to produce an atmosphere of religious equalitarianism which in turn alse applied by analogy in the political and economic spheres.[1] Because spiritualism reached far more people and was more active among the so-called common people, it exerted a total cultural and social influence which far outweighed that of the Puritan mystics. On the whole, the mystics made their contributions primarily through their writings and sermons which tended to exert great influence upon the spiritualists. This too, is a complicated relation which requires further study for clarification.

---

[1] Jones, _Mysticism and Democracy_, pp. 58-104.

[2] Johnson, _op. cit._, pp. 15-29.

[3] Though the Quakers appear to be but the extension of the Finders and a coalescence around the dominant personality of George Fox, they can be treated as a separate sub-type among the spiritualists. This appears necessary because they evolved a distinct type of organization within which a purely spiritual worship could be pursued; thus, they differed from the Seekers and the Finders. Professor W. S. Hudson has also suggested that the Ranters, Muggeltonians, and other such groups be included as a fifth sub-type of spiritualists. If so, this writer would venture to call them antinomian spiritualists, for of all spiritualists, these groups alone actually thought of themselves as transcending the law through a life in the Spirit.

This introduction to the mystical element in Puritanism contends that only when a sufficiently broad yet discriminating typology is applied to Puritan faith and experience will scholars be able to procure both a comprehensive and accurate picture of the development and foliation of Puritanism. The first steps toward such a typology were advanced in chapter one, and the remainder of the thesis attempted an analysis and classification of Francis Rous on the basis of the typology. The numerous questions which resulted from such a limited study have now been stated and not a few tentative answers have been offered for further proof, modification or rejection. In conclusion, one more generalization of an extremely tenuous yet somewhat helpful nature might be offered.

---

[1] Woodhouse, op. cit., pp. 60, 68-69.

Dr. Nuttall in his study of Puritan faith and experience, as it centered about the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, noticed that a chronological treatment of his subject was not, in itself, sufficient. While one could prove that the chronological movement of Puritanism was from Presbyterianism to the various types of Congregationalism, to the Baptists, and finally to the Quakers, that is not a total or fully accurate description of the movement of men's spirits. Some men like Baxter, a moderate Episcopalian, Owen, a Congregationalist, and Tombes, a Baptist, "had more in common with one another than had any of them with a Congregationalist like Craddock." Moreover, the earlier writings of certain men such as Sibbes played an extremely important role in formulating the minds of later radical Puritans.[1] Thus it is clear that neither a chronological treatment nor merely an external history along denominationl lines stressing the fragmentation of Puritanism into various types of polity will be sufficient for an accurate presentation of the development and foliation of Puritanism. It is time that Puritan faith and piety is studied more fully for the light that it will shed upon the development of Puritanism both in its religious and political directions.

In all the attempts to set up the holy commonwealth, in all the stress upon the Puritan ethic, and in all the struggles against the bishops, Puritanism contained within itself certain types of piety or elements of religious experience that cut across the various lines of polity or wings of the Puritan movement. Furthermore, these various types of religious experience had different sociological consequences which were reflected by the individuals within a particular Puritan wing; thus they modified, strengthened, or weakened certain characteristics of their own group and of Puritanism as a total movement in history.

---

[1] Nuttall, op. cit., p. 14.

At a great risk one might well propose that the following types of religious experience were exhibited by Puritanism. First, there was the prophetic type which was outlined earlier in the chapter. It attempted to keep a balance between the inward nature of religion and also the historical objectivity of divine revelation as binding on every individual and on the nation at large. Secondly, there was a strong and numerous group of Puritans who never denied the inwardness of religion but always emphasized its external, historical, literal aspects. These were the men who insisted upon a particular type of polity and worship as divinely ordained and absolutely essential for the well-being of Church and nation. A third type can be called in its broadest application the mystical element of religious experience. It was composed of two groups of men, both of whom advocated the essential inwardness of religion and the extremely personal intimate relation which was more than a psychological union, between God or the Spirit of God and the soul. One group, the mystics, conceived of this relation as existing between the soul and God the Father or God in Christ. The other group, the spiritualists, conceived of the relation as existing primarily between the Holy Spirit and the believer. Because of this different theological orientation the two groups exhibited different attitudes toward various sociological consequences of the Puritan faith. Thus it is essential to distinguish between the two and to indicate the various sub-types within each group.

As it has already been shown, the mystical element of Puritanism did not arise until the opening of the second decade of the seventeenth century. Puritan piety had prepared the way in a positive and negative fashion. But once present in Puritanism, the mystical element became one of the most important aspects of Puritan faith. It had to come to terms in some manner with the Puritan ethic, Puritan cultus, and the attempt to establish the holy commonwealth. In doing this it could not but affect these vital Puritan characteristics. It is the task of future historians of Puritanism to recognize the mystical element within the movement and to trace its effects in the history and expansion of Puritanism.

## II .

A final section should be devoted to the influence of Francis Rous on subsequent history. It is not strange that as an individual his mystical theology shows no remarkable influence on any men or movements of his age. His importance lies in the fact that he was indicative of a certain type of thought within Puritanism and exhibited similarities with men and movements of his own and subsequent age. But before indicating some of the points at which he was in rapport with certain movements, justice should be done to his own mystical theology.

If one expects to find keen and penetrating insights in the mystical theology of Francis Rous, he will be greatly disappointed. But as works of literature and products of theological speculation his mystical treatises rank high in devotional fervency and aptness of expression. His prose style was direct and easy flowing for its day. His choice of metaphors was based upon the facts of everyday experience and were at times striking to say the least. Especially interesting is his use of the metaphor of spiritual children which result from the marriage union between the Christ and the soul. Bernard and Richard of St. Victor were probably the only two previous Christian mystics to use the idea. Certainly Rous was the first Englishman to use it and apply it to a strong ethic.

The close relation between the emotional experience of the spiritual marriage and the resulting production of spiritual children or good works was in itself a major accomplishment in Puritanism. By this device Rous maintained the vastly important Puritan ethic but provided it with a new dynamic. Certainly no English mystic has ever surpassed Rous in his combination of emotional fervency and intense ethical activity. Perhaps one could venture to say that no English mystic, Catholic or Protestant, has ever equaled him in this respect.

The other factor of Rous's mysticism which can lay claim to a uniqueness is the temper of the language he employs in expounding the spiritual marriage. Many Puritans of his day, and many Anglicans, Catholics, and Lutherans as well, used the symbol of the marriage between the soul and Christ the heavenly Bridegroom. But no contemporary of Rous and few Christian mystics before or since went into such detail in the use of that symbol. Certainly none have surpassed him in their use of fervid language with regard to the soul's relation to Christ. Yet throughout his mystical treatises he maintains an atmosphere of purity and highest spiritual elevation.

A few words should be said concerning his relation to his own age and to succeeding movements and individuals. Rous was not unrelated to his contemporaries. There are certain phrases and ideas constantly reappearing in his treatises that make one note a certain similarity to the Cambridge Platonists. At the outset it should be stated that Rous was of a different temperament from that group, and he deprecated man's reason to a far greater extent than they did. On the other hand their emphasis on comprehension and love served the same purpose as did Rous's emphasis.[1] Both were of mutual assistance in adding to the growth of a spirit of toleration.

The greatest similarity between Rous and the Cambridge men was in the use of the phrase "the candle of the Lord."[2] Rous used that term in a number of places, and it always applied to the reason of man implanted in him by God.[3] For both, the term meant reason in its broadest aspects and not just discursive reason. It included man's intuition or faculty of perceiving spiritual truths as well as rational truths. The basic difference between the Platonists' conception and that of Rous is that he looks upon reason as completely "pudled" as a result of the fall. It still operates sufficiently for the law of nature, but it cannot have a true saving apprehension of God. Rous feels that man is bounded by his flesh so his "candle cannot see thorow the thicke Lantern of thy body, to perceive the mysteries of the blessedness of Spirits, nor the glory that is above the Vail of this visible Heaven."[4]

One other indication that Rous was part of a similar tendency or movement such as that of the Cambridge Platonists was in his attempt to discover a number of fundamentals in religion that would serve as a basis for comprehension.[1] Again the difference between the two lies in their respective ways to ascertain the truth. Rous approached the selection from the standpoint of a religious mystic, the Cambridge Platonists approached the problem more as rationalists. But in spite of their difference they were at one with one another and with certain sections of their generation that were seeking fundamentals in religion and philosophy.[2]

---

[1] F. J. Powicke, The Cambridge Platonists, A Study (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), p. 20.

[2] W. C. de Pauley, The Candle of the Lord, Studies in the Cambridge Platonists (London: S.P.C.K., 1937). An excellent survey of the use of this particular term and the place of reason in the theology of the Cambridge men.

[3] Rous, Treatises, pp. 45, 83, 134, 139, 146, 147, 176.

[4] Ibid., p. 45.

Rous had much more in common with Peter Sterry than he did with any of the other Cambridge Platonists. In some respects Sterry should not be classified as a member of that group. If time and space permitted, a long list of parallel passages and ideas could be demonstrated from their writings. Both used bridal symbolism, both spoke of the eye of the soul which alone was able to discern spiritual things, both spoke of the reason as the candle of the Lord, both emphasized the inability of reason in divine truth since the fall, both distinguished between reason and spirit, and so forth. It is also extremely interesting that Sterry sent his young son not to Cambridge to study under the Platonists but to Eaton College, Oxford, where Francis Rous was provost.[3] Also Sterry sat on the Board of Triers of which Rous was the head trier. There appears to be more than similarity of ideas between these two men.

It would be a simple matter to select many comparable passages from the prose and poetry of the English metaphysical poets of the seventeenth century that would exhibit parallels with certain passages in Rous's treatises. But, again, Rous had no apparent connections with any of these men. Certain poems of Richard Crashaw exhibit passages that have almost duplicate passages in the prose of Francis Rous.[1] But the fervency and emotional tension of Rous is articulated in far different expressions from that of Crashaw who as a Roman Catholic dwells more on the Virgin Mary, and infant Jesus than he does on the glorified Christ.

---

[1] Powicke, op. cit., pp. 50 ff., 65 f.

[2] Willey, op. cit., pp. 73, 122 f.

[3] Vivian De Sola Pinto, Peter Sterry Platonist and Puritan 1613-1672 (Cambridge: University Press, 1934), p. 47.

Thomas Traherne is the seventeenth century poet who seems most similar to Rous. But he, just as these other poets, differed completely from Rous on their view of human nature. Traherne especially loved to dwell on the glory of being a child. He did not feel that the fall had radically affected man. However, the similarity between Rous and Traherne is to be found in their celebration of love as the center of man's religious experience.[2] This is particularly the case with the prose writings of Traherne. Francis Quarles also produced several poems of striking similarity to certain utterances of Rous.[3] All of these men referred to God as the "Fountain of Light," and elevated love to the chief place among the virtues.[4]

The group which exhibited at least a major basic similarity to Rous was the Quaker. Apart from Rous's reference to those living in Christ as the "children of light," Rous's close connection between the love of Christ and the resulting life of action and unity in peace is most closely paralled by Quaker faith and practice.[1] His continual reference to the light within and the seed of God were different conceptions than those advanced by the Quakers, but there is a striking similarity of language between the two. It is hardly possible to prove a direct connection between Rous and the Quakers, but again that is not necessary. These ideas propounded by Rous were common property of his Puirtan age, but Rous was one of the earliest Puritans to use them. The fact that they were widely used and that Rous was one of their earliest protagonists places him in the midstream of Puritan thought and experimental theology.[1]

---

[1] The Complete Works of Richard Crashaw, ed., A. B. Grosart (London: Private, 1872), I, 122, 123, 131, 151, 157f., II, 177-178, 196-197, 205.

[2] Thomas Traherne, Centuries of Meditations, ed., Bertram Dobell (London: Private, 1908), pp. 4, 6, 35, 44, 53 f., 108-109.

[3] Francis Quarles, "Light," quoted in Jones, Spiritual Reformers, p. 323.

[4] Rous, Mysticall Marriage, exhibits the passages which most resemble the metaphysical poets. See above, IV, passim.

In conclusion one could do no better than to point to the definite influence of Rous in several different directions.[3] It is known that Bishop Stillingfleet, the great Anglican protagonist of a comprehensive church, owned a copy of Rous's Heavenly Academie.[4] This in itself is no remarkable fact, but it does suggest that Stillingfleet read Rous as one of the foremost early seventeenth century exponents of a comprehensive national established

---

[1] Rous, Treatises, p. 134.

[2] This subject is worth at least a short paper, and the author hopes to undertake that within the near future.

[3] It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the influence of Francis Rous upon Puritan divines and the various men who sat on Parliamentary committees with him. There is not sufficient evidence available to justify any conclusions. Rous did reach his viewpoints much earlier than such men as Peter Sterry and Sir Harry Vane Junior; thus if there was to be any important influence it probably would have come from the older Puritan upon the younger men. But spiritualist and mystical tendencies were abroad at the time and could have exercised influence on those men from any one of several directions. Certainly the attitudes and views of Rous would have strengthened such tendencies.

[4] The copy is owned by the University of Illinois library. Of course, it is admitted that Stillingfleet's basis of comprehension was different from that of Rous; nevertheless, the Heavenly Academie devoted ten pages to the idea that men must tolerate one another because no man can know all the truth and each man has his own particular gift and measure of truth. This too might be taken as a mild argument from skepticism.

Church. Also Rous's Mysticall Marriage was brought to the American colonies at an early date. Further research might reveal its presence in numerous other libraries.[1] The presence of the mystical element in American Puritanism is a problem largely untouched. Research in this field might unearth some interesting facts.

There is one place in which there is no doubt about the influence of Rous's mystical theology. Albrecht Ritschl devoted three pages to the mysticism of Francis Rous in the Geschichte des Pietismus in der reformierten Kirche.[2] It was no less a personage than Voetius who introduced Rous's Interiora regni dei to the Dutch Reformed Church. Ritschl outlined the important points of the theology of the three treatises contained in the above work and indicated that when Rous's mysticism was read by the Dutch theologians, they did not keep the balance between love and action maintained by Rous. Moreover, in using his work the Dutch theologians did not retain Rous's close connection between revelation by the Spirit through Scripture and by the Spirit operating in the hearts of men. A disciple of Voetius, Koelman, translated the Heavenly Academie into Dutch so it was enabled to circulate among the common people. The other two tracts remained in Latin and were accessible only to scholars. But said Ritschl "sie auf den einflussreichsten Theologen der folgenden Generation sehr stark eingewirkt hat."[3] That influence can be seen in Hermann Witsius and Samuel Nethenus.

Finally there is evidence that there is at least a similarity of spirit between the mystical element of seventeenth century

---

[1] Clarence Gohdes, "Aspects of Idealism in Early New England," The Philosophical Review, XXXIX (November, 1930), 541. Cotton Mather was given a copy of the book by Mrs. Usher.

[2] Ritschl, op. cit., I, 128-130.

[3] Ibid., pp. 130, 281, 396.

Puritanism and the later evangelical revival of Simeon and Wesley. This is also a field which is as yet unexplored. The emphasis on the love of Christ and the intimate personal relation of the soul to Christ is but one common belief. Both movements stressed certain fundamentals of Christianity which cut across all denominational lines. The basis for the fundamentals was essentially the same for the evangelicals and for Rous. It was not a rational deduction from the doctrines of Christianity, and it was not the result of skepticism. It was due to the religious conviction that the most elemental factor of the Christian faith was the believer's relation to Christ and union with him. The same truth which was the foundation for Rous's activity in the Cromwellian establishment was the groundwork which permitted the crossing of denominational boundaries by the pietistic evangelical movement and eventually proved to be the basic point of unity for the great nineteenth century Evangelical Alliance. In one sense one can legitimately contend that the mystical element of Puritanism lived on within and without the Church of England to form one of the great source streams for the eighteenth century evangelical movement. This holds true both for English and Continental Pietism.

This generalization remains to be buttressed by more ample documentation, but in the case of the English evangelical revival it is clearly shown by John Wesley.[1] In the Christian Library edited by Wesley, one of the devotional tracts selected from the seventeenth century was Rous's Heavenly Academie. Wesley used the 1702 edition of the treatise, and he also published the forward of that edition.[1] The inclusion of the forward in the Christian Library is of interest because it speaks of the treatise as written for no particular party but for all evangelical Christians. It went on to say that some people might feel that it contained doctrines similar to Popery, but that certainly was not the case. It merely brought back a true Christian emphasis that had been long ignored by Protestants. John Wesley felt a kinship with this evangelical doctrine that was often looked upon as Popery, and he included the Heavenly Academie in the Christian Library as fit devotional reading for all sincere and earnest Christians.[2] The inclusion of a number of Puritan spiritualist and mystical writings in the Christian Library is a good indication of the historical relation between the mystical element of Puritanism and the evangelical revival. So, the type of piety embraced and expounded by Francis Rous, a Puritan mystic, was of greatest import not only in the seventeenth century but also in later evangelical pietism.

---

[1] Henry Scougal, The Life of God in the Soul of Man, ed. W. A. Hudson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948). In the introduction to this seventeenth century devotional gem, Professor Hudson shows the close relation between the mystical element of seventeenth century Protestantism and the Wesleyian revival.

---

[1] F. Rous, Academia Coelestis: The Heavenly University. . . . (London: T. Sowle, 1702).

[2] John Wesley, The Christian Library (Bristol: Felix Farley, 1752), XVI, 217 f.

# APPENDIX A

## THE WRITINGS OF SIR FRANCIS ROUS

This short treatment of the writings of Francis Rous is not intended to be exhaustive or complete. Its purpose is to classify his writings in several categories and to indicate their contents and concerns. Quite naturally, his works fall into three classifications--poetical, polemical or ethical, and devotional. A full list of Rous's writings used for this study is given in the bibliography. With the exception of his metrical translation of the Psalms, all his treatises were available.

Francis Rous began his literary activity as a poet. He wrote a sonnet which was used as a foreword to Charles Fitz-geffrey's poem on Sir Francis Drake. There was nothing remarkable about this poem, but its appearance in 1596 marked Rous's first appearance in print. Much more substantial and of a most acceptable quality was Thule or Vertue's Historie, published by Rous in 1598. This was the first of many imitations of Spenser's style, and according to the editor of the nineteenth century edition of the poem, young Francis Rous showed great promise as a coming poet.[1] But the young poet did not continue to compose lyrics. Soon after entering the study of law, he had a religious experience and retired to think out the implications of that experience.

The only other Poetry Rous wrote after his conversion was his metrical translation of the Psalms. In 1643, he published his translation which attempted to amend many of the awkward and mistranslated passages of the old Sternhold and Hopkins. This original version of Rous underwent numerous revisions by Rous and by Westminster Assembly committees appointed for that task. In 1646, the revised Psalms of David in English Meeter was sent forth by Rous. This version was approved by the Assemble of Divines and by the House of Commons as the official version to be us ed in the churches of England, but it never received the official sanction of the Lords. However, this version became the basis of the official Scottish version of 1650. The Psalms translated by Francis Rous were intended to be a bond of unity between the English and Scottish Church. Peculiarly, the Englishman's version was never official in England but became the basis of the official Scottish version.

---

[1] Francis Rous, Thule, or Vertues Historie, ed. J. Crossley (Manchester: Spenser Society, 1878), introd.

Five of Rous's writings might be classified as devotional literature. They are of differing quality, but the Mysticall Marriage, 1635, and the Balm of Love, 1648, are the most outstanding. His first treatise, Meditations of Instruction, of Exhortation and Reprofe, 1616, contains moralizing with ocasional flashes of devotional fervency. The Art of Happiness,1619, is the most complete and systematic of all his treatises, but it suffers from repetition. It too, however, has passages of rare emotional fervor. The Heavenly Academie, 1638, suffers from too much ornamental quotation, but the text itself is indicative of Rous's mysticism and comprehension in the religious life.

His polemical and ethical treatises were mentioned in the body of this dissertation, but they might be repeated at this point. In addition to his political speeches enumerated in the bibliography, he wrote two political treatises, The Bounds and Bonds of Publique Obedience, 1650, and The Lavvfulness of Obeying the Present

Government, 1649. But by far the greatest bulk of his writing is devoted to polemic and to ethical exhortation. Catholicke Charity, 1641, though containing many passages of devotional beauty, was written against Roman intolerance. The Oile of Scorpions, 1623, The Only Remedy That Can Cvre a People, 1627, and Diseases of the Time, 1622, were all concerned with the national and individual evils of the time and the possible remedies to be applied. But even these treatises contain large sections of devotional material. The Great Oracle, 1641, and Testis Veritates, 1626, both upheld predestination against Arminianism. Mella Patrum, 1650, was really not polemical or ethical, but it was a collection of selected writings of the Fathers. It was intended for those who did not have access to patristic literature, but it was largely a misdirected labor for it received less attention than any of Rous's writings. In 1657, Rous published Treatises and Meditations which contained nine of his most important devotional, ethical, and polemical treatises.

Recently, the very important tract on toleration, The Ancient Bounds of Conscience, has been attributed to Francis Rous. This writer has been unable to determine the exact grounds of such an attribution. Dr. W. K. Jordan is inclined to do so because of "the close similarity in style, point of view, and eccentricities between it and the Balm of Love. . . . ."[1] The editors of the McAlpin Catalogue, Dr. Briggs and Dr. Gillett, also tentatively ascribe it to Rous, but they give no reasons for so doing.[2]

Through a careful reading of The Ancient Bounds, this writer could find none of the phrases or expressions which are peculiar to Rous. There is some similarity of ideas, but the same might be said about any number of writers of this period. The Balm of Love, which appeared in 1648, first appeared as part of Catholicke Charity in 1641; thus, that part of the title of The Balm which speaks of an earlier appearance of the tract refers to its place at the beginning of Catholicke Charity and not to The Ancient Bounds. Also, it was shown in chapter six of this study that Rous was working closely with the Presbyterian party in 1645. Dr. Jordan, too, has pointed out that Rous's activities in 1645 were certainly not in keeping with the sentiments expressed by The Ancient Bounds. Furthermore, the publisher of The Ancient Bounds affords no clue as to Rous's authorship because he never published anything through Matthew Simmons and Henry Overton. Until more definite evidence is given, it seems best to refrain from even a tentative ascription of The Ancient Bounds to Francis Rous.

---

[1] W. K. Jordan, The Development of Toleration in England (London: Allen and Unwin, 1940), IV, 28.

[2] Charles R. Gillett, (ed.), Catalogue of the McAlpin Collection of British History and Theology (New York, 1928), II, 375.

# FRANCIS ROUS PURITAN MYSTIC 1579-1659
## AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE MYSTICAL ELEMENTS IN PURITANISM

It is a difficult task to summarize the arguments and evidence of this thesis. In some respects one can say that it has raised more problems than it has solved. If that is true, then the author is somewhat satisfied.

The existence of Puritan mysticism has received scant attention from historians, and to my knowledge, there have been no studies of any genuine Puritan mystics. The primary aim of this thesis was to prove Francis Rous a Puritan mystic, the first Puritan mystic, and to show how he developed out of Puritanism and related his mysticism to the movement of which he was a part. Rous deserves his place in the history of English mysticism alongside such recognized seventeenth century mystics as Traherne, Crashaw, and Augustine Baker. In order to prove him a mystic an attempt was made to establish a typology which would at once mark him as a mystic yet distinguish him from men who represent a similar tendency of religious experience, but who are, nevertheless, a distinct type of their own.

The secondary aim of the thesis was to advance the typology and the analysis of Rous according to it as the first step in the clarification and elucidation of a greatly maligned, ignored and confused aspect of Puritanism. Thus the discussion attempts to serve as an introduction to the further study of the mystical element in Puritanism, and through that, it hopes to propose several questions with regard to future research in Puritanism.

If the main burden of this monograph is to prove Francis Rous a Puritan mystic of no little importance, the task of defining mysticism or a mystic becomes imperative. An adequate distinction between Puritan mystical thought and Puritan spiritualism has not yet been made. One of the greatest needs in the study of seventeenth century Puritan thought is for just such a typology. This is understandable because of the confusion which results from the failure to make the distinction. In spite of the many parallels between mysticism and spiritualism they do have different centers of gravity which lead to certain pecularities and differences in attitude towards the Church, sacraments, and ministry. Puritan piety and its relation to sociological problems of its day will not be adequately comprehended until its manifold diversity and foliation is properly understood. The nature of mysticism and spiritualism are outlined so one can note their basic differences in theory and consequent differences in practice.

1. Mysticism appears in Christianity as a tremendous drive of the soul to experientially perceive God and to be bound to Him in a full union that transcends a mere psychological relation but retains the distinction between the soul and God; thus mysticism begins with the ego, the I, the separate soul in its search for the union experience.

2. The possibility of such a union taking place depends upon certain presuppositions concerning the nature of man. Christian mysticism has always held to at least the similarity of the nature of man and the nature of God. It expressed this through the doctrine of the imago Dei, or through the "spark" in the soul, the "apex" of the soul, or the word "synteresis." Whether these portions of the nature of man were the actual divine ground of the

soul, a remnant of man's nature left after the fall, or the potentiality of fallen man to be restored through regenerative grace makes little difference at this point. The important thing is that man potentially or actually is capable of gaining or being granted an experiential union with God.

3. Mysticism claims that such a union is possible and attempts to describe how such an experience is given or attained and to communicate symbolically the effects of it. A mystic is he who claims to have had such an exalted union with God. For the Christian mystic this experience is either predominately Theocentric or Christocentric though it is hardly ever exclusively one or the other. The entire Trinity plays a part in the mysticism of all Christian mystics; but usually the experience tends to center about the spiritual marriage with Jesus Christ the heavenly Bridegroom. While the Holy Spirit plays an important role, he is never more than the effector of the mystic way and the union experience.

4. Mystics are at one in either explicitly stating or implicitly exhibiting a so-called mystic path or mystic way that they have undertaken and continue to pursue. Earlier western mystics did not specifically use the term purgation, illumination, and union nor did they consciously systematize their mysticism through the use of those stages; however, their mystical writings clearly indicate the presence of the threefold path as necessary for the union with God. A life of thorough moral training or healthy asceticism was an absolute prerequisite for the vision of God. Only the pure in heart can see God. The mystic was a moral athlete keeping in proper condition at all times that he might not be found wanting for the great union experience or so he might not fail to express properly the results of his experience in daily

living. While asceticism was often looked upon as part of a growth in grace or the sanctification of life, its primary purpose was to keep one ever prepared for heavenly visitations.

5. The result of the union experience or heavenly visitation is inexpressible just as the experience itself is transitory. In his attempt to express his perceptions and experiences of vision or union the mystic is forced to use symbolic language which never quite fully conveys his apprehensions. Furthermore, he must always begin his interior ascent or anagogical ascent from the world of his experience. The transitoriness of the experience means that he must always begin anew either the _via negativa_ and transcend sense and creature or the _via analogia_ and ascend to the first cause itself. Thus the world and earthly empirical experience is that from which the mystic begins and to which he returns.

The definition of mysticism offered in this thesis seems to be of advantage for the study of mysticism as a historical phenomenon in that it offers more certain criteria to determine if a man really belongs to the godly fellowship of the mystics. Too broad a definition fails to do justice to mysticism as it has been practised by admitted mystics through the ages and only succeeds in diluting the meaning of the word to such an extent that it no longer serves as a definitive mark when applied to a person or movement. If the word Christian mystic is to mean anything as a designation of a specific type of believer it must be definitive enough to distinguish that person from others who possess and exhibit similar tendencies but do not follow the specifically mystical life.

It was indicated that mysticism first appears as a tremendous drive in the individual soul to experience a union with God.

It begins with the individual soul seeking and ends with the individual soul partaking of an ineffable inexperience; thus it is primarily individualistic and lays its basic stress on the relation of the soul to God. The experience is really incommunicable and so offers nothing sufficiently tangible to form a cultus of its own. On the other hand, there are several things in the nature of mysticism that make it a definite ally of historical and institutional religion. The fact that it feels the necessity for symbols both as a means to articulate the union experience and as the one way to return again to the vision it once possessed, indicates that mysticism would not wish to transcend the sacraments and ritual of the Church but finds them extremely useful.

Another interesting aspect of the relation of mysticism to the institutional aspect of religion is the fact that it usually caused so little trouble for the hierarchy. This is partially due to the fact that the hierarchy saw that mysticism was always kept well in bounds. But that does not give a complete picture of mysticism and institutionalism. The fact that mysticism is primarily individualistic and that its nature is not sufficiently tangible normally to provide a basis for a sect or for a cult means that it usually arises within the Church and stays within the Church. To the extent that it succeeds in awakening the indifferent and vitalizing dead forms by adopting them as living symbols, it strengthens the institution of which it is a part. To the extent that it clashes with an institution's unwillingness to be enlivened, it operates against the institution of which it is a part. Holding to the conception of the union with God as all important yet transitory and incommunicable, mysticism needs and uses the institution within which it arises.

The basic definition of spiritualism is somewhat easier than that of mysticism, but there are many more subtypes and comlicated wings in spiritualism. It takes four or five principles or characteristics adequately to define mysticism, but there is one basic factor that distinguishes spiritualism and sets it off from mysticism. Though both are part of the experimental element of religious experience, the prominence and central place of the person of the Holy Spirit is the definite mark of spiritualism. Eric Seeberg distinguishes between mysticism and spiritualism on the basis of a Geistgedanke in the latter. Johannes Kühn states that the spiritualist lives in the fullness of the presence of the divine essence which God as Spirit has poured out over the world. There is a radical cleavage between the natural world and the "totally other" spiritual world. The Spirit produces and extends his own kingdom; the strength and might of external force are of no use. The important thing is not the vision of God, the spiritual marriage, or the union, but for the spiritualist the deciding factor in the religious life is the spiritual rebirth through the baptism of the Spirit. It is nothing less than the substantial indwelling of the third person of the Trinity. Basic to the spiritualist, then, is the operation of the Spirit. This accounts for certain attitudes which the spiritualist exhibits towards the sacraments, the Church, scripture, and faith. In all such elements of the Christian life the Spirit was the predominant and important factor while the externals were actually subordinated. Man has a double nature, external and internal, and God operates on man in a two-fold way, through the spiritual inner word and the external signs or symbols. Faith is the direct result of the operation of God's Spirit. The Scriptures are intended only as aids for the operation of the Spirit, and they are sealed inwardly and outwardly. Only the Spirit opens their secrets unto those reborn of God.

Sacraments also have only a relative value in that they point to something else, but they are not the things or vehicle of which they are the sign. God, himself, must touch man in his innermost being without any mediating earthly pictures, ceremonies, creatures, or sacraments. Hence the sacraments were never absolutely necessary for any spiritualist. Schwenckfeld and many other spiritualists advocated "Stillstand" or the suspension of the use of the Eucharist until people understood it properly and practised it according to the will of the Lord which would be fully revealed through the Spirit. Spiritualists usually believed in the possibility of perfection in this life. Perfection was not thought of as a sudden or complete gift. Those living in the Spirit are transformed into an inward likeness of Christ which eventuates in moral perfection insofar as it is possible in this life.

In seventeenth century England,spiritualism appeared at the beginning of the era and burst into full bloom during the Commonwealth and Protectorate and found a permanent embodiment in the Quakers. It exhibited a variety of tendencies but was at one in its emphasis upon the place and the importance of the Holy Spirit. A number of men such as Sir Harry Vane, Josiah Spriggs and others completely subordinated externals to the Spirit and could have suspended them at any time with no appreciable loss in their religious lives. Others such as the Seeker group actually suspended the sacraments and formed no definite church organization but waited upon the Spirit of the Lord to reveal new forms. Another, more radical group of spiritualists transcended all external worship, sacraments, and organization and maintained that they had found true worship as revealed to them by the "power from on high," the operation of the Holy Spirit. William Dell, Thomas Collier, and William Erbury are the best representatives of this type. Thus the English spiritualists expounded all three of the possible spiritualist reaction to externals. Ultimately these differences are dependent upon the spiritualist's conception of the relation between the operation of the Spirit and a doctrine of eschatology.

What, then, are the basic differences between the spiritualists and the mystics? At first glance the similarities of the two seem far greater than the differences. Both are aspects of the experiential element of religion: that is, they place more importance upon the intimate personal relation between the soul and God than they do on the historical, institutional, or intellectual elements of the religious life. Though twins of the same mother, mysticism and spiritualism exhibit certain basic differences that require a distinction between them. Those differences might be outlined in the following way:

1. While both express the drive of the soul for an immediate union with God, the way they conceive of that union and the part it plays in their lives is of great diversity. It is not common for a spiritualist to dwell at great length upon the experience of the vision of God or the spiritual marriage. The two are found in spiritualists' writings but are never greatly emphasized or held up as things to be ardently desired. The union experience is thought of primarily in terms of the Holy Spirit and its substantial or essential presence in the soul. Rather than speaking of the effects of the visitations of the heavenly Bridegroom or the vision of the Absolute, the spiritualist dwells on the rich gifts bestowed by the Spirit on the reborn or those baptized by the Spirit. Their experience is Spirit-centered rather than Christocentric or Theocentric.

Furthermore, if they speak of a union experience they never dwell upon it as the maximum experience to be continually sought. A spiritualist does not seek mountain peaks in his religious experience where he tastes God in an experiential union that far transcends his ordinary dwelling in the Spirit. The important thing for him is his membership in the kingdom of the Spirit and his whole life expressing that in worship and activity. A spiritualist is one who proclaims the superiority of the Spirit of God over all other reality and claims that he has been reborn by the Spirit and is living in the Spirit. The mystic seeks to repeat the experiential union with God which he expresses as the vision of God or the Spiritual marriage.

2. Spiritualists might implicitly or explicitly advocate the so-called mystic way, but it never plays a central part in their thought and certainly is not looked upon as a means of preparing oneself for a heavenly visitation or vision of God. The center of their religious life is the free operation of the Spirit who leads them to truth and activity. While man must not offend the Spirit, he need not follow any specific path to have a greater experimental perception of the Spirit. His object is really not to see God, but to be possessed of the Spirit; hence his asceticism has a different aim and exhibits no definite form.

3. There is something about the possession of the Spirit by the reborn spiritualist that differentiates him from the mystic. The mystic may believe in the perseverance of the saints, as did Rous, but there were great troughs in the spiritual life when the heavenly Bridegroom was not present. The union experiences of a mystic were transitory. There was not that steady presence of the mainspring of the spiritual life. The mystic's life is one of alternating rhythm between ecstatic union and resulting activity or renewed preparation, but the spiritualist's life is one of a steady

beat which may vary in intensity but remains ever certain.

4. In addition to the theoretical or doctrinal differences between the two, there are at least two other areas in which dissimilarities are apparent--cultic and organizational. Spiritualists always take one of three views towards such external manifestations of the religious life. They often subordinated all worship and polity making it clear that though they were retained, they were relative and could be dispensed with at any time. Again, they often rejected the ecclesiastical organization and worship of their day and allowed the Spirit to build up his own Church or awaited the moment when he would usher in the new Church. On the extreme wing, spiritualism looked for no new revelation of outward worship, sacraments, or polity, but they lived the religious life purely on a spiritual plane.

It is much more difficult to indicate what attitude the mystics took toward the cultic and organizational aspects of the religious life. One thing is certain, mystics never fully transcended all externals or felt that worship and organization could be lived wholly on the spiritual plane. Furthermore, a few if any, Christian mystics have ever reached the point of a "Stillstand" with regard to the sacraments. On the other hand the majority of Christian mystics seemed to have found use for the cultic sacraments and ritual of the Church to which they belonged and seldom denied the validity of its organization and hierarchy. Never would a spiritualist fit so easily into the cultic and organizational elements of the religious life.

Certainly, according to the nature of mysticism there is greater room for the appreciation of the historical and institutional elements of religion. Previously we stated that the high point of the mystic's experience--union or spiritual marriage--was but a transitory experience. Having returned to his normal religious life, the mystic seeks or waits for another such experience. That means the mystic constantly begins from the empirical self and the world, proceeds to the union experience or even to heightened contemplation apart from an actual vision of God, and then returns to the ordinary level of consciousness and historical existence.

All surrounding life thus has significance in relation to his goal. Either he aims to withdraw himself step by step from external life, or he aims to proceed on the basis of the creaturely to the successive anagogical steps on the way to union. Cult as worship and sacrament can thus have vast significance as it did for St. Catherine of Genoa. Even the hierarchy could serve as spiritual links in the affirmative way to the Absolute as it did for Pseudo-Dionysius. True, cult and organization were not viewed as commonly understood by the rank and file church members or by the dogmaticians, theologicans, and literally-minded ecclesiastics. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that such an attitude did not try to suspend use of cult or institution or to completely spiritualize them to the total exclusion of all externals.

Puritanism is usually looked upon as a type of Protestant religion that is in complete disagreement with mysticism or spiritualism. Such a view is completely unhistorical and fails to take into account a large segment of the Puritan movement. Though the intellectual, moral, institutional, and historical elements were basic to Puritanism, it is never to be forgotten that even in its earliest stages Puritanism was primarily experiential and emotional. The fact that spiritualism and mysticism did emerge from Puritanism is abundantly demonstrated by the activities and writings of such seventeenth century Puritans as Francis Rous, John Everard, Giles Randall, Peter Strerry, and by such groups as the Seekers, the Finders, the Ranters, and above all George Fox and the Quakers.

There are two ways to account for this phenomenon. One is to attribute it to the incursion of foreign theology through various tracts or persons that came to English shores. The other is to look for a gradual shift within Puritanism itself or for certain legitimate Puritan emphasis that were extended in a mystical direction by certain men. The foreign influence is not to be discounted; however, up until this point it has been the only factor emphasized. It is time scholars of Puritanism explored Puritan piety and faith itself as a major source of Puritan mysticism and spiritualism. A closer scrutiny of those elements in Puritan thought which tended towards mysticism and spiritualism will be extremely helpful in aiding one to account for the emergence of the two out of seventeenth century Puritanism. Two of the earliest illustrations of the following three tendencies were Lewis Bayly in his _Practice of Piety_, and the many sermons of Richard Sibbs, preacher at Gray's Inn.

The three emphases in Puritanism tending towards mysticism were: first, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, not as theoretically maintained by Puritan divines but as practically preached and expounded; secondly, the emphasis upon the immediacy of faith or the extremely personal and experiential relation of the soul to God; and thirdly, the moral consciousness and systematic legalism of Puritanism offered at least certain parallels to the mystic way or to the spiritualist's sanctified life in the Spirit. All three of these were operative in the theology of Francis Rous who proved to be the first genuine Puritan mystic.

Descended from an ancient family of Devonshire, Francis Rous was born in 1579, the younger son of Sir Anthony Rous, at Halton in Cornwall. Among the distinguished visitors at Halton was Sir Francis Drake, the "sea dog." Rous graduated from Broadgates, Oxford, in 1597. His early interest was in poetry, and in 1598 he published one of the earliest imitations of Spencer, a two book poem Thule or Virtue's History. In 1599 he graduated from the University of Leyden where he had studied law, and after returning to England he entered Middle Temple. But in a short time he retired to Landrake, Cornwall to study theology. His first work was not published until 1616, but it showed definite tendencies towards mysticism. His next treatise The Arte of Happiness revealed him as a mystic, but it was not until 1635, after he had emerged from his retirement to enter the political arena, that he produced his most unmistakable mystical treatise, The Mysticall Marriage. From 1625 on he sat in every Parliament, including the Long Parliament, and he was speaker of the Barebones Parliament of 1653. He was on every important Committee that Commons appointed for religion. In 1644 he was named Provost of Eaton College, Oxford. His metrical translations of the Psalms were adopted by the Scottish Church, and they are still sung in English speaking Churches throughout the world. He sat on all the Protector's Councils of State, and he was Head of Cromwell's Board of Triers for the established Church during the Protectorate. The most amazing thing about Rous is the complete reversal of the usual sequence of the meditative and active lives. He retired to meditate in his early twenties and after becoming a mystic, as proved by his writings in his thirties, he then left retirement to become thoroughly involved in the momentous issues of his age.

The source of Francis Rous's mysticism is primarily his Puritanism with its Augustinian-Calvinistic orientation. He quoted and depended upon Gregory, Bernard, Pseudo-Dionysius, and Thomas a Kempis. But, it was Augustine and Bernard that were the most important for him. His concern was for practical piety and an active Christian life, so his theology was not systematic but exhortative. Rous remained a Puritan all his life both with respect to his ethic and to his rootage in Puritan doctrine. He had a modified doctrine of a Lichtmetaphysik which influenced his conception of God, the image of God in man, the fall, and salvation. However, he was faithful to Augustine in never presenting a systematic Lichtmetaphysik. In all the points mentioned above he remained basically a Puritan in doctrine. His Puritanism can be most clearly seen in his doctrine of the fall and salvation. Reason and understanding had been "pudled" by the fall and only effectual grace would save man. He was a thoroughgoing predestinarian. The end of man was the glory of God, and to achieve this God had a great "plot of glory" worked out.

The specific point at which Rous moved beyond contemporary Puritanism and became a mystic were in his belief of the new covenant, the seed of the woman and the mystical union of the soul with Christ. He used these doctrines not as theological concepts but as means of producing and explicating a Christ mysticism expressed in terms of a bridal symbolism. But the most important Puritan doctrine favorable of a mystical interpretation was the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In order for the believer to benefit by Christ's activities, it is necessary that the two become one just as man and wife. Such a union can take place only through the activity of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit becomes the effector of the mystical union between Christ and the believer and also becomes the sanctifier of the new man. The union itself was no longer just the means of appropriating Christ's gifts, it became the means of a conformity to God, of the vision of God at specific moments, or of particular elevated moments of heavenly visitations.

The nature of the mysticism of Francis Rous is clearly seen and easily identified when one applies the typology ennunciated in this thesis. There is unmistakably present the tremendous drive of the soul to experience the closest possible union with God. The possibility of such a union taking place is upheld on the basis of the image of God in the soul of man. Regeneration is first necessary, but the soul of man is a spirit and Christ is the highest Spirit who marries spirits; thus the mysticism of Rous is primarily Christocentric, it tends to center about the spiritual marriage of the soul with the heavenly Bridegroom. He never explicitly outlined the so-called mystic path or specifically used the term: of purgation, illumination, and union. Nevertheless, the threefold path was implicitly present in his ascetic life, and he conceived of the return of heavenly visitations in terms of a continual preparation that involved some such stages in experience. The result of the heavenly visitations was inexpressible just as the experience itself was transitory. As a result, he attempted to express his experiences in terms of marriage symbolism.

Francis Rous carried the marriage symbolism to an extreme never before reached in the history of English mysticism. His fervent emotional language is unsurpassed in intensity, but it retains throughout a purity and elevation that prevents misunderstanding. The full application of the symbol is seen in his insistence upon objective results as a necessary proof of the Bridegroom's visit to his spouse. After the heavenly visitation, the soul bears children or spiritual offspring to her husband. Only two other mystics have ever carried the symbolism to this full application and of the two, Bernard and Richard of St. Victor, only Richard really applied it as fully as Rous. To my knowledge no other English mystic has ever done this. Herein lies the uniqueness of the Puritan mystic Francis Rous.

But the really important aspect of such a doctrine was that Rous used it as the means whereby he could retain intact a fully developed Puritan ethic. In other words, his mysticism did not weaken his Puritanism but strengthened it with a new dynamic. Contrary to most Roman Catholic mystics, contemplation was not superior to action, but it enabled one to undertake the fully active life. This is illustrated in Rous' own personal life. Contemplation was not disparaged, it was to be sought above all things because it enabled one to embrace his beloved and so to bear him fruit. Once a soul experienced a heavenly visitation it had to exhibit the results of that visitation to the world.

Rous did not differ from the Puritan ethic in demanding that all life was to be leveled to the glory of God. There was no neglect of worldly activity because of mystical experiences, but the so-called spiritual children were to be produced within one's own regular calling. Rous did not substitute emotional feeling for ethical activity. What he did do was to supply a new basis and dynamic for the Puritan ethic. Love of God and not the necessity to prove one's own salvation became the dynamic that impelled the believer to activity. At this point one generalization of Troeltsch and Weber is open to drastic revision. Both of them claimed that Puritan mystical thought substituted a fervent subjectivity in place of a deep concern for ethical and moral problems of everyday life. Rous is cited as an example of this tendency. Not only was Troeltsch wrong with regard to Rous, but his whole generalization with regard to English Puritan mystical religion is open to question.

Finally, Francis Rous the Parliamentarian can be explained only on the basis of his mysticism. The most important part of his activity in Parliament was his effort in behalf of a Puritan settlement of the religious problems in England. The things were prominent in his actions and theology. He upheld the necessity of love and peace as a result of all true Christian beings united to Christ Jesus, and so he also upheld the necessity of some type of Church establishment that would see that such a union would be urged and strengthened. Thus he held to the necessity of the preached word, a decently paid ministry, a Church in which worship could take place, and the benefit of the sacraments as helpful for the growth in union with Christ. Here is to be noted his difference from spiritualists in his day.

As a Puritan mystic he still felt the need of the preached Word, the sacraments, and an establishment which saw to the settlement of consecrated ministers in decently settled parishes. He passed through Episcopacy and Presbyterianism in the attempt to realize such an ideal. Only in Cromwell's settlement was a modicum of order reestablished in the English religious scene. Francis Rous was the head Trier of the Board which really was the cornerstone of the Cromwellian establishment. The question of the relation of the various types of the spiritualists to this Board still has to be investigated. Because of its retention of tithes and close connection with the government most spiritualists were either opposed to it or merely tolerated it until a further revelation from the Holy Spirit.

The conclusions of the thesis can be summarized as follows: (1) There is a necessity for a distinction between mysticism and spiritualism that an adequate typology might be set up to aid in correct analysis of the experimental element in Puritanism. This element has not yet been adequately recognized in past histories, but it forms one of the most important streams of Puritan piety and faith. (2) This typology when applied to Francis Rous shows him to be the first Puritan mystic and accounts for his attitude towards Church, sacraments, and ministry. (3) In analyzing Rous' mysticism, it was found that it emerged directly from his Puritanism and remained closely related to it. (4) The marriage symbolism while extremely emotional did not serve as a flight from the world but resulted in an imperative that drove the believer to worldly activity in behalf of the Lord. (5) Rous' Parliamentary activity can be understood only in relation to his mysticism.

Two main questions arise from the conclusions and evidence of this thesis. The first deals with the emergence of the experimental or mystical element of religion out of the surroundings of English Puritanism. Granted certain tendencies in Puritan faith that might facilitate the emergence of mysticism or spiritualism, what if any were the conditions both external and internal that promoted such an outburst? A very tentative answer might well be the following. It was primarily the result of the readaptation of Puritan piety, polity, and theology to the continual frustrations of their attempted reformation of the English Church. It was an antidote to extreme legalism and offered a basis of comprehension transcending severely restricted boundaries. It first appeared after the fulminations of extreme literalists, and it flowered in the Commonwealth era when no one church succeeded in bringing uniformity and peace. Further research will be required for this important problem.

The second question is that provoked by the typology. If there are two distinct types of the experimental element in religion which have different sociological consequences, should not that fact be noted in the future studies of Puritanism? Will not an adequate typology succeed in classifying men and movements in Puritanism and so in portraying a more accurate picture of the history of Puritanism? Only in that way will similarities and differences become apparent, and one will be able to understand why men of different types of polity still have more in common than they often have with men in their type of polity.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Sources

Abbot, Wilbur C. (ed.). The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937-1945.

Ames, William. Conscience With the Power and Cases Thereof, Divided into Five Bookes. . . . . London: E. G. for I. Rothwell and others, 1643.

The ancient Bounds, or Liberty of Conscience, Tenderly Stated, Modestly Asserted, and Mildly Vindicated. London: Henry Overton, 1645.

Aspinwall, William. An Explication and Application of the Seventh Chapter of Daniel. London: L. Chapman, 1654.

Baillie, Robert. Letters and Journals 1637-1662. Edited by David Laing. 3 vols. Ediburgh: Robert Ogle, 1842.

Bayly, Lewis. The Practice of Piety, Directing a Christian How to Walke That He May Please God. London: John Hodgets, 1615.

Bernard, of Clairvaux. Cantica Canticorum: Eighty Six Sermons on the Song of Songs. Translated and edited by Samuel J.Eales. London: Elliot Stock, 1895.

Birch, Thomas ( ed.). A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe. London: Fletcher Gyles and Thomas Woodward, 1742.

Bonar, A.A. (ed.). Letters of the Rev. Samuel Rutherford. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1875.

Bornkamm, Heinrich. "Mystik, Spiritualismus und die Anfänge des Pietismus in Luthertum," Vorträge der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen. 44 Folge. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1926.

Bruce, John (ed.). Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament. . . . . taken in the House by Sir Ralph Varney. . . . . Camden Society Reports, Vo. XXXI. London: J. B. Nicholos and Son, 1845.

Calvin, John. The Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by John Allen. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936.

________. Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis. Translated by John King. Vol. I. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1847.

Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*. Edited by W. D. Mcray. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888.

Cobbett, William (ed.). *Parliamentary History of England from* t *the Norman Conquest in 1066 to the Year 1803*. Vols. II, III. London: R. Bagshaw, 1807-1808.

Cradock, Walter. *Glad Tydings from Heaven: To the Worst of Sinners on Earth*. London: Matthew Simmons, 1648.

________. *Gospel-Holinesse, Or, The saving sight of God. . . . .* London: M. Simmons, 1651.

________. *Gospel libertie, In the Extensions, Limitations of it . . . . .* London: M. Simmons for Henery Overton, 1648.

________. *Mount Sion, Or, The Privilege and Practice of the Saints.* London, 1649.

________. *Saints Fulness of Joy in their fellowship with God. . . . .* London: Matthew Simmons for Hannah Allen, 1646.

Cusanus, D. *The Single Eye, Entituled the Vision of God. . . . .* Forworded by Giles Randall. London: John Streator, 1646.

Dell, William. *Select Works*. London: John Kendall, 1773.

Dobell, Bertram (ed.). *The Poetical Works of Thomas Traherne*, 1636-1647. London, 1903.

Edwards, Thomas. *The Casting Down of the Last and Strongest Hold of Satan, Or, A Treatise Against Toleration and Pretended Liberty of Conscience. . . . .* London: George Calvert, 1647.

________. *Gangraena: Or, a Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies, and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this Time. . . . .* London: Ralph Smith, 1646.

________. *The Second Part of Gangraena: Or A fresh and further Discovery of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and dangerous Proceedings of the Sectaries of this time. . . . .* London: Ralph Smith, 1646.

*An Enquiry after further satisfaction concerning abeing a change of Government beleeved to be unlawfull. Tendred to Presbyt. Prop. (F. Rous Elder) by way of reply to his book.* London: G. T., 1649.

Erbury, William. *The Testimony of William Erbery, Left Upon Record For the Saints of suceeding Ages. Being a Collection of the Writings of the aforesaid Author, for the benefit of Posterity. . . . .* London: Giles Calvert, 1658.

Everard, John. *Some Gospel-Treasures Opened: Or, The Holiest of All Unvailing. . . . .* London: R. W. for R. Harford, 1653.

*The Grand Case of Conscience stated about Submission to the pre-Power. An answer to a book concerning the Lawfulnesse of submitting to the present Government*. London 1649.

Grosart, A. B. (ed.). *The Complete Works of Richard Crashaw*. 2 vols. Printed for Private Circulation, 1873.

Haller, William (ed.). *Tracts on Liberty. . . . .* 3 vols. New York: Columbia University, 1934.

Nalson, John. *An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State. . . . . 1639 to the Murther of King Charles I.* Vols. I, II. London: S. Mearne, T. Dring and others, 1682.

Notestein, W. and Relf, F. H. (eds.). *The Common Debates for 1629, Critically Edited*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1921.

Owen, John. *Of Communion with God The Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost. . . . .* (Oxford: A. Lichfield, 1657.

________. "The Death of Death In the Death of Christ." *The Works of John Owen*. Vol. X. Edited by W. H. Goald. London: Johnstone and Hunter, 1852.

________. *Two Discourses Concerning the Holy Spirit and His Work*. Glasgow: Edward Khull and Co., 1816.

Pagitt, Ephraim. *Heresiography, Or a Description of the Heretickes and Sectaries Sprang Up in these latter times. . . . .* London: William Lee, 1654.

Penney, Norman (ed.). *The Journal of George Fox.* 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1911.

Pohill, Edward. *Speculum Theologiae in Christo: Or, A View of Some Divine Truths. . . . .* London: A.M. and R. R. for T. Cockerill, 1678.

________. *Christus in Corde: Or, The Mystical Union Between Christ and Believers. . . . .* London: A. M. and R. R. for T. Cockerill, 1680.

*Reliquiae Baxterianae or Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times*. London: T. Parkhurst, J. Robinson, J. Lawrence, and F. Dunton, 1696.

Rous, Francis. *The Arte of Happines*. London: W. Stansby for Iohn Parker, 1619.

________. *The Balm of Love: To Heale Divisions*. . . . . London: John Wright, 1648.

________. *The Bounds and Bonds of Publique Obedience, Or a Vindication of our lawfull submission to the present Government* . . . . . London: John Wright, 1650.

________. *Catholicke Charity: Complaining and Maintaining, That Rome is uncharitable to sundry Eminent parts of the Catholick Church. . . . .* London: R. Young for John Bartlet, 1641.

________. *Coelestis Academia.* *Qui est Tractatus Primus.* Londini, 1655.

________. *The Great Oracle, Even, The maine Frame, and Body of Scriptures. . . . .* London: R. O. and G. O. for I. Bartlet, 1641.

________. *The Heavenly Academie. . . . .* London: Robert Young for John Bartlet, 1638.

________. *Interiora Regni Dei*. Londini, 1655.

________. *The Lavvfulness of obeying the Present Government and Acting under it. . . . . By one that Loves all Presbyterians lovers of Truth and Peace, and is one of their communion.* London: John Wright, 1649.

________. *Mella Patrum. . . . .* Londini: T. Maxey and S. Gellibrand, 1650.

________. *Meditations of Instrvction, Of Exhortation, Of Reprofe: Indeavoring The edification and reparation of the house of God.* London: I. L. for George Gibbs and Francis Constable, 1616.

________. *The Mysticall Marriage, or Experimentall Discoveries of the heavenly Mariage betweene a Soul and her Saviour.* London: W. I. and T. P. for I. Emery, 1635.

________. *Mysticum Matrimonium Quo Junguntur Christus et Ecclesia*. Londini, 1655.

________. *Oile of Scorpions.* *The Miseries of these Times turned into Medicines and Curing themselves*. London: W. Stansby for John Parker, 1623.

________. *The Onely Remedy That Can Cvre A People.* *When all other Remedies faile.* London: James Boler, 1627.

________. *A Religious and Worthy Speech. . . . in Parliament Concerning the Goods, Liberties, and Lives, of his Majesties Subjects.* London: W.H., 1641.

________. *Mr. Rowse, His Speech Made in the lower House of Parliament . . . . . In opposition of the making of . . . . Bishops (lately elected by his Majesty) till a setled Government in Religion be established in this Kingdome.* London, 1642.

________. *A Speech Made Before the Lords in the Vpper House. . . ; .Against Dr. Cossens, Dr. Maynwaring, and Dr. Beale; Upon the Complaint of Mr. Peter Smart*. London: John Wright, Junior, 1641.

________. *Testis Veritates. The Doctrine of King James our late Soveraigne. . . . . Plainly showed to bee ONE in the points of Predestination, Free Will, certainty of Salvation. With a discouery of the Grounds both Naturall and Politicke of Arminianism*. London: W. I., 1626.

________. *Thule, or Vertues Historie.* Edited by J. Crossley. Manchester: Spenser Society, 1878.

________. *Treatises and Meditations*. London: Robert White for Wright, 1657.

Rushworth, John (ed.). *Historical Collections. . . . .* 7 vols. London: D. Brown, J. Walthoe, and others, 1721-1722.

Rutherford, Samuel. *A Survey of the Spirituall Anti-Christ. . . . . In which is revealed the rise and spring of Antinomians, Familists, Libertines, Schwenckfeldians, Enthysiasts c. In Two Parts.* London: Andrew Crooke, 1648.

Saltmarsh, John. *Dawnings of Light: Wherein the true Interest of Reformation is opened in generall. . . . .* London: R.W. for Giles Calvert, 1644.

________. *Holy Discoveries and Flames*. London: R.Y. for P. Nevill, 1640.

________. *Sparkles of Glory, Or, Some Beams of the Morning Star . . . . .* London: Giles Calvert, 1647.

Scougal, Henry. *The Life of God in the Soul of Man*. Edited by Winthrop S. Hudson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948.

*A Second Part of the Religious Demurrer, by another hand. An answer to a tract by F. Ross. . . . .* London: Thomas Underhill, 1649.

Seldon, John. *Table Talk.* Edited by S. H. Reynolds. Oxford: University Press, 1892.

Sibbes, Richard. *The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D., Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge: Preacher of Gray's Inn,* London: Edited by A. B. Grossart. 7 vols. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1862-1864.

Sterry, Peter. *The Appearance of God to Man In The Gospel. . . . .* London, 1710.

________. *The Clouds in Which Christ Comes opened in a Sermon before the Honerable House of Commons, assembled in Parliament . . . . .* London: R. Dawlman, 1648.

________. *The Coming Forth of Christ in the Power of His Death. . . . .* London: C. Sumptner for Thomas Brewster and Gregory Moreli, 1650.

________. *The Spirit Convincing of Sinne. . . . .* London: T. Foreet for H. Overton and Benjamin Allen, 1654.

________. The Way of God with His People in These Nations. . . . . London: Peter Cole, 1657.

Theologia Germanica. Translated from the German by Susanne Winkworth. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893.

Traherne, Thomas. Centuries of Meditations. Edited by Bertram Dobell. London: 1908.

________. Poems of Felicity. Edited by H. I. Bell. London: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Vane, Sir Harry Junior. The Retired Man's Meditations. . . . . London: Robert White, 1655.

________. Two Trestises: viz I An Epistle General to the Mystical Body of Christ on Earth. . . . . II The Face of the Times . . . . . London, 1662.

Vaughan, Henry. Sacred Poems and Pious Ejaculations. London: George Bell and Sons, 1891.

Ward, Nathaniel. Discalliminuns, or, A Reply to a late book by Francis Rous called Bounds and Bonds. London, 1650.

Winkworth, Susanna. The History and Life of the Reverand Doctor John Tauler of Strasbourg; with Twenty-Five of his Sermons. Translated by S. Winkworth. New York: Wibey and Halsted, 1858.

Whitelock, Bulstrode. Memorials of the English Affairs. . . . . 4 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1853.

Wood, Anthony A. Athenae Oxionienses. . . . . Edited by Philip Bliss. Vol. III. London: F. C. Rivington, 1817.

## Public Documents

Great Britain. Journals of the House of Commons, 1640-1648. Vols. I, II, III, IV, V.

Great Britain. Journal of the House of Lords. Vols. IV, V, VII, VIII.

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I. 22 vols. London: 1858-1893.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy. Vox. XXIX London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1900-1925.

## Secondary Works

Adams, Charles, Francis. (ed.). *Antinomianism in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1636-1638*. Boston: Prince Society, 1894.

Addison, C. M. *The Theory and Practice of Mysticism*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1918.

Allen, J. W. *English Political Thought 1603-1660*. 2 vols. London: Methuen and Company, 1938.

Baeumker, Clemens. "Witelomein Philosoph und Naturforscher des XIII Jahrnunderts." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*. Band III, Heft II, Munster: Aschendorff, 1902.

Bailey, Margaret L. *Milton and Jacob Boehme: A Study of German Mysticism in Seventeenth Century England.* New York: Oxford Press, 1914.

Barclay, Robert. *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876.

Barker, Arthur. *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma 1641-1660*. The University of Toronto Press, 1942.

Bernstein, Edward. *Cromwell and Communism*. Translated by H. J. Stenning. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1930.

Boase, George C. and Courtney, William P. *A Catalogue of the Writings, Both Manuscript and Printing of Cornishmen. . . . Vols. II, III.* London: Longmans, Green and Deyer, 1874.

Braithwaite, William C. *The Beginnings of Quakerism*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912.

Brayshaw, A.N. *The Personality of George Fox.* London: Headley Brothers Publishers, 1905.

Breen, Quirinus. *John Calvin, A Study in French Humanism*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Erdman Co., 1931.

Brett, S. R. *John Pym, 1583-1634*. London: John Murray, 1940.

Bronkema, Ralph. *The Essence of Puritanism.* Goes, Holland: Osterbaan and Le Cointre, 1929.

Brown, Louise Fargo. *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum*. London: Henry Frowde, 1912.

Buchan, John. *Oliver Cromwell*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

Burrage, Champlin. *The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research*. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.

Bush, D. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: University Press, 1945.

Butler, Dom Cuthbert. *Western Mysticism*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1923.

Carruthers, S. W. *Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society of England and America, 1943.

Clark, Henry W. *History of English Nonconformity*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1911.

Cobb, W. F. *Mysticism and the Creed*. London: Macmillian and Co., 1914.

Coleman, F. W. *English Mystics of the Fourteenth Century*. London: Epworth Press, 1938.

Collins, Joseph B. *Christian Mysticism in the Elizabethan Age*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940.

Dakin, A. *Calvinism.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Paul A Study in Social and Religious History.* Translated by William E. Wilson. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.

De Pauley, W. C. *The Candle of the Lord. Studies in the Cambridge Platonists.* London: S. P. C.K., 1937.

Devine, Arthur. *A Manual of Mystical Theology*. London: R.and T. Washbourne, 1903.

Dexter, Henry M. *The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years. . . . .* New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1880.

Dowden, Edward. *Puritan and Anglican: Studies in Literature.* London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1901.

Ewer, Mary A. *A Survey of Mystical Symbolism*. London: S. P. C.K., 1933.

Farges, Albert. *Mystical Phenomena.* Translated by S. P. Jacques, London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1926.

Firth, Charles H. *The Last Years of the Protectorate.* 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909.

________. *Oliver Cromwell*. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925.

Fleming, W. K. *Mysticism in Christianity*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913.

Flynn, John Stephen. *The Influence of Puritanism on the Political and Religious Thought of the English*. London: John Murray.

Fuller, Thomas. *The History of the Worthies of England*. 3 vols. London: Thomas Tegg, 1840.

Gardiner, Samuel R. *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate 1649-1660*. 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.

________. *History of England From the Acession of James I to The Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642*. 10 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1884-1891.

________, *Oliver Cromwell*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.

________. *The Personal Government of Charles I, 1628-1637.* 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1877.

*The General Biographical Dictionary. . . . .* Edited by Alexander Chalmers. Vols. XXV, XXVI. London: J. Nichols and Son and others, 1816.

Glass, Henry Alexander. *The Barbone Parliament, First Parliament of the Commonwealth of England, 1653*. London: James Clarke and Co., 1899.

Goeters, Wilhelm. *Die Vorbereitung des Pietismus in der reformierten Kirche der Niederlande bis zur Ankunft Labadies 1666*. Weimar: Hof, 1909.

Haller, William. *The Rise of Puritanism . . . . . From Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Harnack, Adolph. *History of Dogma*. Translated by N. Buchanan. Vol. V. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1903.

Haroutunian, Joseph. *Piety Versus Moralism, the Passing of the New England Theology*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1932.

Harrison, A. W. *Arminianism*. London: Duckworth, 1937.

Hensen, H.H. *Puritanism in England.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912.

________. *Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century*. London: John Murray, 1903.

Herman, Mrs. E. *The Meaning and Value of Mysticism.* Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1915.

Hetherington, Wm. M. *History of the Westminster Assembly of Dines*. New York: R. Carter and Brothers, 1853.

Hexter, J. H. *The Reign of King Pym*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941.

Holl, Karl. "Augustins inere Entwicklung." *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirkengeschichte*. Band III. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohre (Paul Siebeck), 1928.

Hopkinson, Arthur W. *Mysticism: Old and New*. London: Nisbet and Company, 1946.

Hügel, Baron Friedrich von. *The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and Her Friends*. 2 vols. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1927.

Hughes, Thomas H. *The Philosophical Basis of Mysticism*. Edinburgh; T and T. Clark, 1937.

Hunt, John. *Religious Thought in England From the Reformation to the End of the Last Century.* Vol. I. London: Strahan and Co., 1870.

Hutton, William H. *The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne.* London: Macmillan and Co., 1903.

Inge, William R. *Christian Mysticism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

________. *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought.* London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926.

James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience.* New York, Modern Library.

Jones, I. Deane. *The English Revolution an Introduction to English History, 1603-1714*. London: William Heinemann. 1931.

Jones, Rufus M. *The Flowering of Mysticism*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1939.

________. *Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

________. *Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries.* London: Macmilland and Co., 1914.

________. *Studies in Mystical Religion*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1909.

Jordan, W. K. *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938-1940.

King, Rachel H. *George Fox and the Light Within,* 1650-1660. Philadelphia: Friends Book Store, 1940.

Knappen, Marshall M. *Tudor Puritanism*. Chicago: University Press, 1939.

________. (ed.). *Two Elizabethan Diaries.* Chicago: American Society of Church History, 1933.

Knowles, Dom David. The English Mystics. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1927.

Krapp, Robert M. Liberal Anglicanism, 1636-1647. Ridgefield, Connecticut, 1944.

Kristeller, Paul O. The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino. Translated by Virginia Conant. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

Kühn, Johannes. Toleranz und Offenbarung. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1923.

Leuba, James H. Psychology of Religious Mysticism. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1929.

Louismet, Dom S. Mysticism True and False. London: Burns and Oates, 1919.

Lovejoy, A. O. The Great Chain of Being. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Lysons, Daniel. The Environs of London being a Historical Account . . . . . Interspersed with Biographical Anecdotes. Vol. II. London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1810.

Lysons, Daniel, and Lysons, Samuel. Magna Britannia . . . . . Vol. 3. London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1814.

Masson, David. The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of His Time. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1881-1896.

Miller, Perry. The New England Mind, the Seventeenth Century. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1939.

Miller, Perry, and Johnson, Thomas H. The Puritans. New York: American Book Company. 1938.

Mitchell, A. G., and Struthers, J. (eds.). Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons, 1874.

Moffatt, James. The Life of John Owen, Puritan Scholar. London: Congregational Union of England and Wales.

Neal, Daniel. The History of the Puritans. . . . . from . . . . . 1517. . . . . to 1688 . . . . . 5 vols. London: William Baynes and Son, 1882.

Noble, Mark: Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell. 2 vols. London: G. G. J. and J. Robinson, 1787.

Nuttall, Geoffrey F. The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Nygren, Anders. Agape and Eros. Translated by Philip S. Watson. 2 vols. London: S. P. C. K., 1939.

Pease, Theodore C. *The Leveller Movement. . . . .* Washington: American Historical Association, 1916.

Perry, Ralph B. *Puritanism and Democracy*. New York: Vanguard Press, 1944.

Pinto, Vivian De Sola. *Peter Sterry, Platoninst and Puritan, 1613-1672*. Cambridge: University Press, 1934.

Poulain, Père. *The Graces of Interior Prayer*. Translated by L. L. Yorke Smith. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1912.

Powicke, Frederick J. *The Cambridge Platonists, A Study*. Cambridge: University Press, 1926.

________. *The Reformation in England.* London: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Pratt, J. B. *The Religious Consciousness, a Psychological Study*. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Récèjac, E. *Essay on the Bases of the Mystical Knowledge.* New York: Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Reid, H. M. B. *The Holy Spirit and the Mystics.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1925.

Ritschl, Albrecht. *Geschichte des Pietismus in der reformirten Kirche.* Bamd I. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1880.

Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*. Vol. III. New York: Harpers, 1877.

Scott, W. M. *Aspects of Christian Mysticism*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1907.

Seeberg, Erich. *Zur Frage der Mystik*. Leipsig: A. Deichert, 1921.

________. "Der Gegensatz zwischen Zwingli, Schwenckfeld und Luther." Rheinhold Seeberg Festchrift. Band I. Leipzig: Deichert, 1929.

________. *Gottfried Arnold, in Auswahl herausgegeben.* München: Albert Langen und Georg Müller, 1934.

Sharpe, A. B. *Mysticism: Its True Nature and Value, with a Translation of the "Mystical Theology" of Dionysius. . . . .* London: Sands Co., 1910.

Shaw, William A. *A History of the English Chyrch During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth, 1640-1660.* 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900.

Stephen, Sir Lesley, and Lee, Sir Sidney. (eds.). *The Dictionary of National Biography.* 63 vols. New York: Macmillan Co., 1885-1900.

Stoughton, John. *History of Religion in England from the Opening of the Long Parliament to the End of the Eighteenth Century*. Vols. I, II. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1882.

Tawney, R. H. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1926.

Tindall, William Y. *John Bunyan Mechanick Preacher*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

Trevor-Roper, H. T. *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1940.

Troeltsch, Ernst. *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*. Translated by Olive Wyon. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan Co., 1931.

Tulloch, John. *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*. Vol. I. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1872.

Underhill, Evelyn. *The Essentials of Mysticism and Other Essays.* London: J. M. Dent and Co., 1920.

________. *The Mystics of the Church*. New York: George H. Doran Co.

________. *Mysticism, A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness.* New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1911.

________. *The Mystic Way, a Psychological Study in Christian Origins*. London: J. M. Dent, 1913.

________. *Practical Mysticism*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1914.

Vaughan, R. A. *Hours with the Mystics.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.

Wach, Joachim. *Sociology of Religion.* Chicago: University Press, 1944.

Waite, Arthur E. *Studies in Mysticism*. London: Hodder and Stough- 1906.

________. *The Way of Divine Union*. London: William Rider and Son, 1915.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930.

Weingarten, G. H. W. *Die Revolitions Kirchen Englands.* Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1868.

Wesley, John. (ed.). *The Christian Library.* Vol. XVI. Bristol: Felix Farley, 1752.

White, Helen C. *English Devotional Literature 1600-1640.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1931.

Willey, Basil. *The Seventeenth Century Background.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1934.

Wolfe, Don M. *Milton and the Puritan Revolution*. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1941.

Woodhouse, A. S. P. (ed.). *Puritanism and Liberty Being the Army Debates (1647-49) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents.*

## Articles

Bainton, Roland H. "Marriage and Love in Christian History," *Religion in Life*, XVII (Summer, 1948).

Channing-Pierce, Melville. "Francis Rous: Mystic and Man of Affairs," Congregational Quarterly, XXV (April, 1947).

Davis, Godfrey. "Arminian versus Puritan in England, ca. 1620-1640," *Huntington Library Bulletin*, V (April, 1934).

Gillett, Charles R. "The McAlpin Collection of British History and Theology," *Union Theological Seminary Bulletin*, VII (January, 1924).

Gohdes, Clarence. "Aspects of Idealism in Early New England," *The Philosophical Review*, XXXIX (November, 1930).

Hexter, J. H. "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents," *American Historical Review*, XLIV (October, 1938).

Hudson, Winthrop S. "Economic and Social Thought of Gerrad WinStanley, Was He a Seventeenth-Century Marxist?" *Journal of Modern History*, XVIII (March, 1946).

________. "Mystical Religion in the Puritan Commonwealth," *Journal of Religion*. XXVIII (January, 1948).

________. "Scottish Efforts to Presbyterianize the Church of England During the Early Months of the Long Parliament," *Church History*, VIII (September, 1938).

Jones, Rufus M. "Mysticism," *Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.* Edited by James Hastings. Vol. IX, 1928.

Miller, Perry. "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXXII (February, 1935).

________. "Puritan Theory of the Sacraments in New England," *The Catholic Historical Review*, XXII (April, 1936-January, 1937).

"Mystik," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. . . . . Herausgaben von Hermann Gunkel und Leopold Zscharnack. Band IV, 1927.

Wach, Joachim. "Caspar Schwenckfeld, A Pupil and Teacher in the School of Christ," Journal of Religion. XXVI (January, 1946).

## Unpublished Material

Johnson, George A. "From Seeker to Finder: A Study in Seventeenth Century English Spiritualism Before the Quakers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Divinity School, University of Chicago, 1948.

Maclear, James F. "The Puritan Party, 1603-1643; A Study in a Lost Reformation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Divinity School, University of Chicago, 1947.